

Artillery Corps.

Lawrence Carter Crawford, at large, to be second lieutenant, March 18, 1902.

George H. Terrell, of Texas, to be second lieutenant, March 18, 1902.

William Scott Wood, of Virginia, to be second lieutenant, March 18, 1902.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT.

William W. Chance, of the District of Columbia, late captain and signal officer, United States Volunteers, to be first lieutenant, September 23, 1901.

INDIAN AGENT.

George D. Corson, of San Carlos, Ariz., to be agent for the Indians of the San Carlos Agency, in Arizona.

SURVEYORS OF CUSTOMS.

Perry M. Lytle, of Pennsylvania, to be surveyor of customs in the district of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania.

Mahlon M. Garland, of Pennsylvania, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Pittsburg, in the State of Pennsylvania.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Nevada N. Stranahan, of New York, to be collector of customs for the district of New York, in the State of New York.

POSTMASTERS.

Annie H. Leaf, to be postmaster at Fort Washington, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania.

William S. Linton, to be postmaster at Saginaw, in the county of Saginaw and State of Michigan.

William E. Ward, to be postmaster at Ridgeville, in the county of Randolph and State of Indiana.

James F. Brenaman, to be postmaster at Alexandria, in the county of Madison and State of Indiana.

I. Warner Arthur, to be postmaster at Bryn Mawr, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania.

William E. Brown, to be postmaster at Linesville, in the county of Crawford and State of Pennsylvania.

James M. Hundley, to be postmaster at Summitville, in the county of Madison and State of Indiana.

Addison Eppehimer, to be postmaster at Royersford, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania.

James W. Bartlett, to be postmaster at Doylestown, in the county of Bucks and State of Pennsylvania.

Solomon S. Ketcham, to be postmaster at Overbrook, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *March 31, 1902.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of Saturday's proceedings was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. LANHAM, by unanimous consent, obtained leave of absence indefinitely, on account of important business.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the sundry civil appropriation bill; and pending that motion I ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENTON] whether he is prepared now to suggest a time for closing general debate?

Mr. BENTON. Not exactly. About two hours and a half have been asked for on this side, so far as I know. I do not know what arrangements the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE], the leading member of the minority of the committee, made before he left the city. I suggest that the gentleman from Illinois allow the debate to run along for a while without any arrangement, and it may be that before night we can agree to close the debate this afternoon.

Mr. CANNON. I have not had any application for time for general debate on this side. I think I can get through myself in thirty minutes. What does the gentleman say to closing the general debate with the end of to-day's session? If the debate gives out we can, of course, commence the consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule earlier.

Mr. BENTON. I would not like to agree to that until I see whether other members, that I do not now know about, have been promised time by the gentleman from Arkansas. So far as I am personally concerned, I will say that I would be willing to close the general debate at the close of to-day's session. I suggest, however, that for the present the debate run along without any arrangement.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am desirous of passing this bill, not with lightning speed, but as rapidly as may be practicable from a business standpoint. I have no desire to prevent reasonable debate, but I trust that later we may agree that the debate close to-day.

Mr. BENTON. I prefer to ask the gentleman to let the debate run along without limitation until the close of the day.

Mr. CANNON. I have accepted the suggestion of the gentleman upon that point.

The SPEAKER. The question is now the motion of the gentleman from Illinois, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13123) known as the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. LAWRENCE in the chair, and proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13123) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill may be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose in presenting this bill to the committee to take much time. So far as I am concerned, I am content with saying that the bill has been carefully prepared by the Committee on Appropriations, is believed to provide liberally for the public service, and I should be glad to have it considered at this stage of the session in good faith directly upon the merits of the bill. With the large latitude that has been given to general debate and under the five-minute rule heretofore, I suggest that we have come to a time in the session when we could well devote ourselves to the matter in hand.

The bill is pretty thoroughly analyzed by the report, being report No. 1260. If gentlemen now or hereafter desire to have the bill in a nutshell, the report thoroughly gives it. The estimates, original and supplemental, for this bill amount in round numbers to \$61,779,000. The bill recommends \$49,323,000, or, in other words, below the estimates the bill recommends \$12,455,000. The bill for the current year, for purposes of comparison, carried nearly \$62,000,000. The present bill is a reduction over the bill for the current year of twelve million and a half of dollars. Your committee in the consideration and reporting of this bill, while it has striven to and I believe has recommended liberally for the public service, has made its recommendations from the standpoint of the new conditions that surround the Treasury, in light of the tax-reduction bill of last year covering, as is estimated, \$41,000,000, and in light of the bill now pending in conference to remove the remainder of the war taxation, estimated at \$70,000,000, the two together, if this legislation is enacted, and I will assume that it is to be enacted, because it is morally certain that it will be, making a reduction of revenues of \$111,000,000.

I am heartily glad of it, because it leaves sufficient revenue, in my judgment, under the law when thus amended to carry on liberally the public service. I am not here to talk to any considerable extent about the undesirability of too much revenue. There is only one thing worse than too much revenue, and that is too little revenue. I think when the law is amended, as it is soon to be, that we will strike the happy medium, gathering great blocks of revenue for great blocks of service, and that we will be armed when the law is thus amended with weapons of defense against those who would exploit the Treasury of the United States for too much of appropriation. The report explains in detail the various reductions.

One matter that explains considerable of the reduction is that last year one very large item—three millions and a half—was carried by this bill for the public debt that the United States was bound to pay of the Hawaiian Islands, and so on, with other various matters, some of that kind and others representing real economies in the public service. There are many things that we considered, that were estimated for, that are not in this bill. One that I will call attention to was a small estimate of \$5,000 for the purpose of making plans for a National Museum building. Gentlemen understand the necessity for that building. That something ought to be done in the early future is patent. Your Committee on Appropriations tried to place a limitation on the plans. We called in the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institute, and we examined various public officials to see if we could not make that limitation.

After consideration they did not believe that a building could be constructed for less than \$4,000,000. Your committee is of opinion that we ought not to commence plans upon a \$4,000,000

basis. In our judgment we can build for one million and a half to two millions of dollars a building that will answer the National Museum for the next quarter of a century, and when those who have such matters in charge come to the ideas that your committee has touching this matter it will be time enough to grant an appropriation to begin the plans. There was much of pressure, as there is before many committees, to take into consideration extensive erections of public buildings and plans for the same in the District of Columbia; much of pressure for the improvement of parks in the District of Columbia. Your committee went quite fully into this whole subject. That some additional buildings are required in the city of Washington is patent; that something of improvement is required for the public parks in the city of Washington is evident, but after a full investigation substantially your committee have not recommended that action be taken at this time.

There is a great industry here in the city of Washington, and there is but one industry here, and that is to exploit the public treasury for improvements in the city of Washington without cost to the local population. I do not say this unkindly. It is but natural, and history repeating itself as to all capitals of great nations. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to talk a great while about this bill, but I am inclined to accept the conditions of the Committee of the Whole, as noted, that it would, perhaps, be best to discuss this bill under the five-minute rule. We have made one recommendation, however, for an improvement to one of the parks of the city—that is, to begin an improvement at Potomac Park, \$70,000. Gentlemen, understand that some years ago, by law, the Potomac Flats, which have been reclaimed in large part, were dedicated as a public park, and are now a part of the system. It will cost a great deal of money to properly improve this great park, and we ought to go at it slowly, but we ought to make progress. After full investigation, your committee recommends \$70,000 for the purpose of continuing a road along the river bank in the vicinity of the national monument, for the purpose of building a wall about where the public bathing beach is now situated, and for the removal of that bathing site to barges or elsewhere other than it is now.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if he has yet discussed the recommendation of the committee as to the Yellowstone Park?

Mr. CANNON. No.

Mr. BENTON. At the proper time I should like a statement about that.

Mr. CANNON. If my friend will remind me a little later on, I will come to that.

Your committee might perhaps well have made additional recommendations, but in the present condition we thought best to rest with this one recommendation.

Great plans have been made for the extension of the park system in the District of Columbia. We already have a great park system, many hundreds of little parks scattered all through the city, and then we have the Zoo. We have Rock Creek Park, and have had it for many years. The future is well cared for and well assured from the standpoint of the Government service in the District of Columbia and for the convenience of its inhabitants and for the welfare and pleasure of all the people. But this system of parks being reserved, we can go slowly. The Almighty did much in the Rock Creek Park. If you just let it alone, making a few roads, which are gradually being constructed, you can not improve much upon nature, and it will not be necessary for a decade to make much of an expenditure in that splendid park.

There is a park commission proposition that has never been adopted by Congress, and, so far as I am concerned, I am inclined to say never will be adopted by my vote. It was not a self-appointed commission, but a commission appointed by the coordinate branch of Congress under a resolution. That commission made their plans, splendid and magnificent. When the improvement is complete, it is to cost \$200,000,000. As I understand it, it involves the condemning of all the territory between the Mall and Pennsylvania avenue, and the payment of the damages from the public Treasury, and a great many other matters that in my judgment ought not to be enacted.

Mr. BENTON. Is it not a matter of fact that this property was once the property of the Government and that they are proposing to buy it back?

Mr. CANNON. I am not advised as to that. That may be true; but it is now the property of individuals. I will not enter upon a discussion of its merits. It may come later in connection with this bill or some other bill. My position and that of your committee, I think without dissent, as I understand it, is about as follows: That for construction of public buildings to carry on the public business in the city of Washington we stand quite ready to cooperate, and recommend all apt appropriation as speedily as the public service requires and the public revenues will allow, with due regard for the public service elsewhere in the United States.

The second proposition is to beautify the city without regard to the public service and to make it a beauty spot in the United States. As to that great project the position of your committee is that we shall go just so fast in beautifying the city of Washington as the people of the city of Washington are willing to go and no faster, paying half the expenses thereof by taxation. That is a very good check upon that kind of improvements. Therefore, in the improvement of this park, \$70,000, which but commences it, we provide that one-half of that sum shall be paid from the revenues of the District. And so as to all the great park systems of the District of Columbia, your committee are thoroughly of opinion that they ought to be and must be improved, one-half from the Treasury of the United States and the other half by local taxation.

There is one other matter that I want to call to the attention of the committee. There is a great cry for a hall of records in the District. There is a great cry for the erection of a palace of justice, a new State Department, and so on, and so on. Some of these works might well be commenced, but they ought to be commenced with care to make them fairly agree with the improvements that have been made in the District on the one hand and to shut off extravagance upon the other.

Much that is said about a hall of records might well be unsaid if the Government of the United States paid enough attention to the records of the United States to preserve the records that ought to be preserved and to destroy those that are of no account.

I will illustrate what I mean. Your committee made an investigation touching the records in the Census Office, and we found there in a rented building substantially fireproof the population schedules from the First Census down to the present. They came asking an appropriation of \$15,000 to bind the population schedules of the census of 1890. They have done it for several years. We have turned it down for several years, and on this investigation we find now of those old, useless population schedules, commencing with the year 1790, 400 tons, kept in a rented building, heated and lighted, with watchmen and laborers and a force of clerks. They are of no manner of use on earth in my judgment except to furnish a reason for paying rent to somebody to house them and to afford employment to the employees who have charge of them. You know what a population schedule is. That is the schedule that the enumerator makes out when he visits you all over the country: How many in the family? Married? How many children? Ages, residence, where born, and so forth, and so forth. Well, now, those schedules come in and are tabulated, and the tabulation is published, and after that, in my judgment, they are of no account.

When the question of destroying them was presented, those having them in charge threw up their hands in holy horror. "Oh," you say, "but what use are they?" "Oh, somebody may want to know who lived at Winsted, in Connecticut, in 1790, and what was his name and whether he was married." "Well, but it is not evidence." "Well, but sometimes we get inquiries." They are not evidence. Now, then, I undertake to say that 400 tons of population schedules, some of which has been taken care of for a century and all of which are being cared for now by a force of clerks, laborer, watchman, light, heat, and rent ought to be destroyed. And there are lots of records of no more account than these. If we had the departments intelligently cleared of useless records, in my judgment there is plenty of space to accommodate the public service of the United States in the city of Washington.

Another matter that your committee investigated. On the sundry civil law for the current year the following provision is found:

To enable the Architect of the Capitol to prepare and submit to Congress at its next session plans, specifications, and estimates of cost for reconstructing and extending in a fireproof manner the central portion of the Capitol building; the renovation and decoration of the Rotunda; also for the construction of a fireproof building adjacent to the grounds of the Capitol building, to be used for offices, storage and power plant purposes connected with the Capitol building, \$1,500, to be immediately available.

The Architect of the Capitol took this question up. Gentlemen may be aware that the Capitol never was completed; that on the east part the original plans, specifications, and drawings were all made long ago. There was to be a wing east corresponding with the wing west. The Dome itself extends over the wall on the east. It would add to the architectural effect, would give more room, that is needed, in the Capitol. It would permanently house the Supreme Court, with consultation rooms, ample quarters for attorneys, ample quarters for a library, and would almost, in addition, double for committee rooms space that was added in the western extension of the Capitol. Now, the investigation shows that to complete the Capitol would cost \$2,500,000; to renovate the rotunda \$275,000.

In addition to that, under this provision of the law the Architect of the Capitol has ascertained that to construct a tunnel from the Capitol somewhere to land that is south of us, or southeast or southwest, near by the Capitol grounds, and to complete a building with 400 rooms in it, in a style of architecture that would

comport fairly well with the surroundings of the Capitol and Library of Congress, and construct a tunnel from the Capitol to such building, constructing such a building with a great basement that would hold all the documents and that would hold in addition the heating apparatus of the Capitol, move it all out and your lighting apparatus into such a building, giving additional room in the Capitol for committee rooms, removing the condition that we have from musty documents, that the construction of such a building would cost, in round numbers, \$4,000,000, and that, with the completion of the Capitol, would cost \$6,775,000.

In the judgment of your committee this is one of the earliest improvements that ought to be made in the public buildings. On the Senate side Senators have their office rooms in the Maltby Building or the Capitol. On the House side there is a very general complaint upon the part of members that if they have places in which to transact their business that they have either to utilize quarters at their houses and hotels or that they have got to go and lease them. This scheme, if adopted, would enable each Representative to have a comfortable room near by the Capitol for office purposes. [Applause.]

Now, I call attention to this fact because I want the House to bear in mind that after investigation for a hall of records, a new State Department, a new Department of Justice, and various other schemes that are talked about ought to wait until this improvement is authorized and begun before these are authorized. This, in my judgment, is the first thing to do. Now, then, I want to say further, that your committee did not see proper to report this provision, but have suggested that I call attention of the House to it for the reason that in the present condition, with this reduction of a great block of the revenue, that probably it would be well enough to wait until we could reasonably forecast what the revenues will be before we authorize or recommend the construction—until the next session of Congress.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Was there any investigation by the committee as to whether it was feasible or not to add more stories to the Capitol building, and thereby provide rooms for members for work?

Mr. CANNON. Your committee was thoroughly satisfied, from taking counsel with the architects in part—and you know they do not entirely agree—but the best opinions seems to be that it would not be practicable to do more than to expend \$2,000,000 in continuing to complete the Capitol, for the eastern extension, according to the original plan. We therefore consider that it would be much better to get rid of the heating and lighting apparatus and construct a building just across from the public grounds here.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Did the committee make any inquiry as to the feasibility of erecting stories on top of this building?

Mr. CANNON. The consensus of opinion seemed to be against it.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. The gentleman's suggestion as to the construction of a building to accommodate members of Congress has been postponed, has it?

Mr. CANNON. We did not report any provision for the same for the reason that with the universal hunger for promotion of the public service—and I speak of it respectfully, because I am one of the hungry ones, along with other gentlemen—that under all the conditions, with what is in front of us at this session of Congress, we thought best to call the attention of the House to the various propositions that would probably be pressed upon us in connection with public buildings in the District, and to express our opinion that, everything considered, in our judgment, that matter had better go over until the succeeding sessions of Congress.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I trust the gentleman from Illinois will pardon me for the interruption, but I feel a great interest in the question. If members of Congress would express their wishes about it now, does the gentleman believe that the committee would recommend it?

Mr. CANNON. It would be in the power of the House, if they want to commence it at once, to do so.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. It seems to me it is more important to preserve the health of members of Congress than it is to preserve the old, dusty records.

Mr. CANNON. I think so, and I am calling it to the attention of the House, so that if we do not commence it now—whether we commence it now or at the next session this is the first great improvement along the line of public buildings that ought to be undertaken in Washington, because, in the judgment of the committee, it is the most needed.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. It seems to me that the suggestion that the committee makes will meet with the hearty concurrence of all the members, not only as to the mere suggestion, but that they would be in favor of taking it up and going on with it.

Mr. CANNON. Well, that is the object of my calling the attention of the House to the matter.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I desire to supplement what the gentleman from Alabama has just said, and I think it will meet with the unanimous approval of the members of the House. This is the first construction that we ought to begin. I hope the gentleman's committee, under his able and economical administration, will see to it that the much-needed building is started early in its progress.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, there is one other matter, answering my colleague from Missouri [Mr. BENTON], that I want to call attention to, and that is the improvement of Yellowstone Park. Gentlemen understand about it. For twenty-five years, substantially, we have been appropriating money for the improvement of Yellowstone Park. We have been paying current expenses and adding a little improvement year by year, until there is a condition of that park that satisfies your committee, after very thorough inquiry, ought to be met. All necessary roads can be constructed, all necessary bridges can be constructed, all the roads can be surfaced so as to get rid of the dust and get a permanent, firm road, including the making of the necessary roads across the forest reservation to the south of the park and bridges across the forest reservation east of the park, open a road from Great Falls to Yanceys, and otherwise finish these improvements for about \$750,000. It will require three years to do it. If done, it will be under the charge of the engineers of the Army; in fact, these improvements for a number of years have been under their charge, and the park has been policed for a number of years by a troop of cavalry.

Your committee was of opinion, after a thorough investigation, that this work ought to be completed, and then it can be maintained annually thereafter for about \$30,000. So we appropriated \$250,000 and authorized contracts for the two succeeding years of \$250,000 each, with a view of completion of this work.

Now, I will not multiply words, but it seems to me I have fairly covered the ground in connection with the recommendations in this bill, and when we come to consider it under the five-minute rule I will stand quite ready to answer any suggestion that can be urged or answer any questions to the best of my ability.

How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Thirty-eight minutes.

Mr. LLOYD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question. I notice the statement that the committee has reduced the expenditure of the Geological Survey \$80,000. What is the purpose of that reduction?

Mr. CANNON. That is apparent and not actual. On page 2 of the report the gentleman will see that it says:

This reduction is apparent, not actual, \$60,000 having already been appropriated for investigation of the mining resources of Alaska and \$11,200 for rent of building being transferred to the legislative act, leaving, in fact, a net increase of \$1,000 in the total appropriations for the Survey, which amount is given as an increase in the appropriation from \$3,000 to \$4,000 for expenses of transmitting documents through the Smithsonian exchange.

Mr. LLOYD. I notice the remarks in the report. I note in the estimate made by the Department amounts to \$1,024,207, while the committee have appropriated \$880,000. What was it that they applied for and what is it that the committee have not included in the appropriation?

Mr. CANNON. They wanted an increase all along the line. There was a provision on the bill for the current year that directed the Secretary to make specific estimates for his whole force; and in the making of those estimates there was somewhat of an increase. On fuller investigation we concluded it was not practicable for the Secretary to estimate or the committee to recommend specifically for the scientific corps, because, in our judgment, it is a live service, and the Bureau had better be left to this administration employing scientists from time to time for necessary work, and then letting them go out of employment when not required. That explains part of the matter. Another part is the publication of maps. My recollection is that for this they wanted \$100,000; we gave them \$70,000.

I want to say, touching this service, that it is a great service, a growing service. It has got about legs enough to crawl itself. [Laughter.] It has a wonderfully bright head and a wonderfully meritorious one I will frankly say, in my judgment.

Mr. LLOYD. I concur in what the gentleman says on that point.

Mr. CANNON. It grows, you know, like a green bay tree. I think we have fairly well cared for it. I trust it may always remain as efficient as it is now and may always keep out of the rut in which much of the public service is apt, and to contract the disease of dry rot.

Mr. LLOYD. Is it not true that a considerable sum was asked as an additional appropriation for topographical survey?

Mr. CANNON. Fifty thousand dollars more was asked for that purpose.

Mr. LLOYD. Was any necessity shown for that \$50,000 additional?

Mr. CANNON. That was for additional work, as we understood. The truth is there would be a demand for \$1,000,000, if we would give it. They would take the amount and would do the work. But this service has grown quite rapidly; and after investigation your committee is of opinion that the amount recommended is sufficient. My friend knows that we must leave something for future generations to do.

Mr. LLOYD. Was there anything else for extension of the service? The gentleman sees the point I am trying to reach. What was it which the committee appropriated that would extend the service? The gentleman says that \$50,000 was for additional expenditure in topography. I want to get at the amount they desired to expend which would expand the service.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I think there was an estimate for an additional party to go to Alaska.

Mr. LLOYD. You have already provided for that?

Mr. CANNON. We have already three parties—

Mr. LLOYD. You have already provided for that, have you not?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; but they want another one.

Mr. LLOYD. How much more money?

Mr. CANNON. I do not recollect; I think \$20,000. It seemed to us that this matter might wait. This whole question can come up, however, under the five-minute rule.

Mr. LLOYD. All right.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I was not able to hear the whole statement of the gentleman from Illinois, because I was called out of the Hall. Therefore he will allow me to ask, Does this bill carry an appropriation for improvements in this District—for what is termed "beautifying Washington?"

Mr. CANNON. It carries the usual appropriation for the park system.

Mr. RUCKER. No extension—no increased amount?

Mr. CANNON. There is an increase of \$70,000 for improvements on the Potomac Flats—the making of a roadway along the bank of the river adjacent to the Monument and extending of the wall where the bathing establishment is now.

Mr. RUCKER. This bill does not carry any appropriation for making these extensive improvements that we have been reading about in the papers?

Mr. CANNON. The parking system?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. Nay, nay.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman spoke about the construction of a building for offices. That is practically useful, I suppose—needed?

Mr. CANNON. I believe the committee is of that opinion. I most certainly am.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman considers that much more necessary than the appropriation of large sums of money for the purpose of beautifying the city of Washington?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, I am satisfied that the first thing that ought to be done toward extending the public buildings in the city of Washington is to complete this Capitol according to the original design and make the improvements indicated.

Mr. RUCKER. Let me ask the gentleman another question. I believe the appropriations made for the improvement of this city must be borne one-half by the General Government and one-half by the city of Washington?

Mr. CANNON. Well, that is not entirely so. We are trying to extend that principle—the principle of half and half.

Mr. RUCKER. Are there any appropriations here for public improvements—I do not mean Government improvements, but improvements of the city or District—of which the District does not pay half?

Mr. CANNON. We have upon this bill in many instances, especially in extending and improving the parks, succeeded in getting the appropriations made on the half-and-half principle. In regard to this improvement on the Potomac Flats we provide for payment half and half.

Mr. RUCKER. Does the gentleman believe that every improvement of that nature ought to be borne by the District?

Mr. CANNON. I do.

Mr. RUCKER. And none of them paid for in whole by the Government? Now, if the gentleman will kindly answer me, if he can. This half which is paid by the city or the District, of course, is raised by local taxation?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. There has been a good deal of discussion in the newspapers about the taxation of personal property here. Will the gentleman advise me as to whether personal property is taxed here?

Mr. CANNON. Practically, I understand not.

Mr. RUCKER. Then, does not the gentleman believe that before we appropriate another dollar for expenses, one-half of which

the city ought to pay, that the city ought to be required to tax personal property?

Mr. CANNON. I will say to my friend that the newspapers say that the District Committees that have charge of legislation are considering that subject, and it has been announced that provisions to be recommended are about ready. Your Committee on Appropriations has delayed the preparation of its appropriation bill for the purpose of seeing whether or not such legislation would be enacted, and as one member of that committee I am not willing to provide for expenditures for improvements of the District proper except as the District contributes its quota.

Mr. RUCKER. Its half.

Mr. CANNON. And I trust before this bill is enacted—I mean the District bill that is to come later—that legislation under the lead of the District Committee of the House and of the District Committee of the Senate will provide for an increase of revenue. I trust that will be the case.

Mr. RUCKER. There is a proposition pending to make a loan of ten or fifteen millions of dollars to the District. Does that come before the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. CANNON. No, that would not. That would involve legislation of which the District Committee of the House would have jurisdiction.

Mr. RUCKER. And not yours.

Mr. CANNON. In my judgment it is not necessary to make a loan. In my judgment if there was a fair assessment of the real estate of the District of Columbia that the revenues would be increased a million of dollars, say, or more, by reason of that fair assessment. Then if there was a fair assessment of the personal property of the District, of the capital stock of the various corporations, and the choses in action, substantially like such property is taxed in the States, in my judgment it would yield at least a million and a half of dollars of revenue. That would make two millions and a half, and two millions and a half increase, with a like amount added from the national Treasury, will do all the work that is desirable to be done in the District of Columbia, in my judgment, and as fast as it ought to be done without the borrowing of one cent.

Mr. RUCKER. Then it is the best policy of the Government to impose taxes on all the personalty and money, stock, bond, choses in action and force the District in that way to raise a part and the Government pay its part, rather than to loan.

Mr. CANNON. I have no doubt that the property of the District ought to be taxed for the benefit of the District revenues as it is taxed elsewhere.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman doubtless has seen in the papers that taxation of personal property might compel some rich gentlemen to leave the District.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I do not know. It seems to me that if they should insist on going on that account I would fracture the Constitution for the purpose of hoisting a flag and hiring a band as they depart. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUCKER. I am very glad to hear the gentleman say that. I agree with him. One other proposition. If they do not go, the newspapers say they might be forced to commit perjury in order to hide their property. The newspapers here in Washington say that.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I hardly think that is correct.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman understands me—

Mr. CANNON. I do not believe that any great block of people would commit perjury. Once in a while, for a great many centuries, individuals have lied, and I think where a man would tell a lie for gain he would probably swear to it, but I do not think that is the rule.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman understands me. I do not charge it, I merely say I saw it in the newspapers. I see that argument advanced that gentlemen here would commit perjury rather than pay taxes.

Mr. CANNON. Well, we want to be lenient in our minds with our friends in the District. I do not mean that we want to fail to enact legislation, but they have just the same kind of people here that they have in every other capital, namely, people who desire to get the most they can at the expense of all of the people and bear as little burden at their own expense as possible.

Mr. RUCKER. I fully agree with what the gentleman has said about leniency to the people of the District of Columbia, but I think, also, that we ought to be fair with our people at home, and if in doing that we force some rich men to leave the city of Washington I would join the gentleman in hoisting the flag and hiring the band, and if they stay and violate the law let them be dealt with like any other man who violates the law.

Mr. CANNON. I do not believe that many gentlemen of wealth—I do not believe that any gentleman of wealth—would leave the District of Columbia under just taxation; and now, to be candid, for fear I may have been misunderstood, I am very glad that any American citizen who sees proper to come to Washington to live should come. And it is no crime, in my eyes, for a

man to be rich. I would stop just when I made him contribute his share, according to his property, for the public service.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Is there any law authorizing the taxation of personal assets now in the District of Columbia?

Mr. CANNON. None that is enforced, as I understand it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Why is it not enforced? What is the trouble?

Mr. CANNON. Well, I think probably that the machinery, as I understand it, is not provided for its enforcement, as is claimed.

Mr. GROSVENOR. There was a cog left out of the machinery.

Mr. CANNON. Probably a cog left out.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. A cog removed; not left out.

Mr. CANNON. A cog removed, says my colleague from Massachusetts, and I accept that statement, because he knows more about it than I do.

Mr. GROSVENOR. They have just ceased to collect.

Mr. CANNON. But it is our business to put the cog back.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes; I agree with you. They took that cog out, and then kept entirely quiet and did not appeal to Congress to put the cog back; just went quietly along, and then finally said there was not any law authorizing the assessment of personal property, and asking us to tax our constituents the full half of all the expense, while they kept, perhaps, a full half off from the tax duplicate. That is about the way of it, as I understand.

Mr. CANNON. Well, it is so alleged, and I think very likely that is correct.

Mr. GROSVENOR. And in the meantime the District of Columbia has become a haven of rest for those who dislike to pay taxes elsewhere; and they drift here and obtain a nominal residence, without paying any taxes here, and reporting themselves as nonresidents of the State from which they came.

Mr. CANNON. I fear that is the case; I do not know, but I suspect that is the case in many instances.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Do not you think it would be a good cure for that to refuse to appropriate money until some system of taxation is enforced here that will equalize those assessed upon our own people?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, as Congress is the common council for the District, a better cure is that, knowing the evil, we apply the remedy.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Very well.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I have endeavored as best I could to hear the colloquy between the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENTON] and the gentleman from Illinois a few moments ago, and I assume that the chairman of the committee [Mr. CANNON] stated that it was his desire as a member of the committee to see that the District of Columbia paid one-half of the expenses for the beautifying of the parks of the District, and that that was the principle involved in the appropriation contemplated for the improvement of the Potomac Flats beyond the Monument. I should like to ask the gentleman whether there is any improvement, of the general scope of the improvement of the Potomac Flats embodied in this bill, wherein that principle of having one-half of the expense paid by the District of Columbia is omitted?

Mr. CANNON. No; I think it is not omitted.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. May I ask the gentleman the amount of the appropriation beyond the Monument?

Mr. CANNON. Seventy thousand dollars.

Now, I will yield ten minutes of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY], who wishes to leave the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Illinois has but four minutes remaining.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana ask to be recognized?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I ask to be recognized in my own time. I intend to use about ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. If no one desires to address the committee in opposition, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Indiana. If anyone desires to address the committee in opposition, he will be recognized.

Mr. BENTON. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY] is a member of the committee and of the subcommittee. I am in charge of this side, and I have no objection to the gentleman from Indiana using such time as he desires. I intended to make a short statement myself, but I can do it afterwards. I think the gentleman is entitled to some time in his own right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair always endeavors to alternate in recognizing gentlemen.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I will state to the Chairman that if there is anyone who desires to be heard now, I will wait. I only want to use ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I do not often consume the time of this House by speaking, but I am so deeply interested

in one item in this bill and in the legislation that I hope will speedily follow, that I feel it is my duty to urge upon Congress that we act and act promptly. I refer to the item of \$200,000 to enforce the Chinese-exclusion law.

You ask why appropriate this money when this law expires by limitation May 5.

My answer is that the bill reported to this House from the Committee on Foreign Affairs or the one now pending in the Senate must be passed and become law before May 5 or this Congress will go into history as committing the greatest crime that has been committed by lack of legislation in many years. I urge that there be no longer delay, but that this legislation be enacted at once. Then the Department will find waiting the money now on hand from our last appropriation and \$200,000 more that we appropriate by this bill, so that the safeguards that have been heretofore adopted and such other safeguards as are necessary to enforce the law and prevent Chinamen getting into this country may be carried into effect.

When the gentleman with smooth tongue, who wants cheap labor in order that his profits may be increased, urges that Chinese labor will do no harm, do not listen to him for a moment, but push him aside and tell him you stand for that great mass of American citizens who are earnestly striving to uphold the standard for the American wage-earner, and for his cottage home, for good clothing and food for his wife and children, and you have no use for the man who wants to degrade him and ruin his home and family by placing him in competition with Chinese labor. I believe in protection of American industries, but, my countryman, how much more important it is to protect our American wage-earner who has had so much to do with making this the greatest nation on earth. Then let us delay no longer. We have before us the bill reported from the committee of our own body.

No one can fail to see how well drawn it is, or how intelligently and conscientiously the original author of the bill and the committee have labored over it, and they deserve and will receive for their splendid work the thanks of their colleagues in both Houses of Congress, and not less the hearty thanks of the great public which has such a vital interest in the success of this all-important measure. If it is not perfect it can be amended.

I shall vote for this bill with the greatest pleasure, and I wish to do all that I can to promote its passage, believing as I do that it is not only for the interests of the American public—that is far too cold and colorless a phrase—but that it is absolutely essential for the continuance of our American institutions and civilization.

The original bill, as it came from the hands of the distinguished member from California, was strong and praiseworthy. The amendments have merely made it still stronger and more praiseworthy. I especially welcome the amendment which provides for keeping Chinese immigrants out of our insular possessions as well as out of our mainland. It has been repeatedly thrown in the teeth of the dominant party that it was proposing to allow Chinese labor to be made use of extensively in the Philippine and Hawaiian islands, so as to enable American manufacturers and capitalists to go to those islands and produce goods there by Chinese labor cheaper than we can produce them at home with American labor, and thus allow some of our own employers and producers to cut under our own prices and undermine the precious structure of American industry. This amendment fully meets and disproves all such allegations, and its necessity, on general principles, is evident. I am very glad it has been incorporated in the bill.

The bill is carefully drawn so as to do no injustice to anybody. No true American wishes to do injustice to any foreigner, be he European, African, or Asiatic. The bill amply provides for the rights and conveniences of Chinese entitled to enter or reside in this country—the Chinese laborers registered as residents, or the Chinese teachers, students, merchants, and travelers who may wish to enter and remain temporarily in the United States. There can be no complaint against the bill on this score. The gentlemen who have appeared before the committee in opposition to the bill, the gentlemen who are so desirous of increasing their profits in trading with China, say that they are not pleading the cause of coolie labor, that they do not object to the prohibition of Chinese labor in this country. Then why do they object to this bill?

They say all they care about is to make sure that Chinese teachers and merchants are not interfered with. Wherein does this bill interfere? But they say it will make China angry and so injure their trade with China. Why should it make China angry? The Chinese Government and the higher classes of the Chinese people can not blame us for not wanting to have millions of coolies dumped into our country to vitiate our civilization and to swamp our labor market. There is no objection on our part to the coming here of Chinese teachers, students, merchants, and travelers on legitimate business and in a legitimate manner, and the only reason why their entrance is hedged about with the formalities and restrictions enumerated in the bill is in order that we may

guard our country against the entrance of laborers under false pretenses in the guise of students, merchants, etc., which has been so great and so frequent an abuse in the past.

Why, then, should the Chinese Government or the Chinese privileged classes complain of the bill? And how can the bill injure our Chinese trade? There is nothing in this objection of the opposition. It is a mere scarecrow.

But I hasten to say that even if the passage of the bill should offend China seriously, and even if it should cost us every dollar of our Chinese trade, that would be infinitely better than for the bill to fail and not to become a law. What is the favor of China and what is the value of our Chinese trade compared with the degradation and ruin of our American labor? At all hazards, Mr. Chairman, and whatever else may or may not happen, Chinese cheap labor must and shall be kept out of this country. It is a terrible misfortune that so much of it has already been admitted. Not another single solitary Chinese laborer should be permitted ever to set foot on American soil. The Chinese may consider it a signal evidence of mercy and forbearance on our part that we have conceded so much to them already.

They come over here as foreigners, to remain foreigners, and living in holes and hovels and swarming like vermin, underbidding and crowding out our laborers, getting all the money they can from us and spending none of it, incurring none of our civic obligations, keeping aloof from our civilization, adopting none of our ways, introducing their own filthy ways, and contaminating the moral and physical atmosphere with their rotten and pestiferous practices. They are unlike all other immigrants. They are not wanted here, and must stay away.

This is a most serious question, Mr. Chairman, from the standpoint of American labor. No more serious question has ever come up for settlement, and none more serious ever could come up. Our American laboring men and women are subjected to a quite severe enough competition among themselves at best. The rewards and returns of labor are scanty enough at best and under natural conditions. But what rewards and returns can Anglo-Saxon labor hope for if subjected to competition with Asiatics who can and do live on 2 cents' worth of rice a day? This is the practical question connected with this bill.

It is a question whether we shall keep up the standards of life in the ranks of American labor, and strive to continue to elevate those standards or deliberately degrade them to the Chinese level. How can any true-hearted American contemplate the latter alternative without horror? But this would infallibly and inevitably be the result, unless the rigid exclusion of Chinese laborers decreed by this bill is maintained.

The injury already done to American labor on the Pacific coast, and to a considerable extent all over the country, by Chinese labor has been very great. There is no telling how many Chinese there are in our far West. The census is entirely unreliable on that point, simply because the Chinese hide and skulk and evade enumeration and identification as much as possible. There are over 50,000 of them in San Francisco alone, and they swarm all over the Pacific and Mountain States. They have practically monopolized the labor field in the Alaska fisheries, and in the Pacific States they have driven to the wall our American working men and women in the lines of household service, cigar making, boot and shoe making, bag making, tailoring, laundering, farming, brick making, mine working, and railroad working, not to speak of many other industries.

But I need not tell over again this old familiar tale of how our honest, brave American working men and women on the frontier have been wounded thus in the house of their friends. The workingmen of the United States—the backbone of this country—stand as a unit, shoulder to shoulder, on this question. They may differ as to other questions, but they are unanimous in their appreciation of this one great overshadowing peril and menace.

At the last convention of the American Federation of Labor, held at Scranton, Pa., in a report of the executive officers, the plea was made for the extension of law for exclusion of Chinese, and they said, in part:

Apart from the fact that we are workingmen, we are also American citizens, fully imbued with the grand principles underlying our form of government and our present system of civilization. The introduction or continuance of an element so entirely at variance with our economic, political, social, and moral conceptions, and so utterly incapable of adaptation to the Caucasian ideas of civilization, is not only dangerous to us as a class but is destructive of the various institutions we are so earnestly striving to uphold, maintain, or attain. Whatever may be the opinion of others, to us this matter does not permit a compromise.

Chinese exclusion is an issue upon which all organized labor is a unit.

The hearthstone of the American citizen is in danger.

Every incoming coolie means the displacement of an American and the lowering of the American standard of living.

It represents so much money sent out of the country.

So much more vice and immorality injected into our social life in its place. We can not afford to trifle with a race of people so utterly unassimilative, so ruinous to our general prosperity, and so blighting to our every prospect.

Comparison with immigration of other peoples is only possible by contrast. While we object to an indiscriminate influx of other foreign laborers, we maintain that discrimination in the case of Chinese immigrants is impossible.

We insist upon an exclusion act which will effectively exclude. Provision must be made for proper enforcement of the law when enacted, and the jurisdiction and execution of the law so conferred as to remove it from the legal juggling to which former laws have been subject.

In this plea all organized labor of this country join and urge us to act. You ask that proper provision be made for the enforcement of the law when enacted. I am glad, Mr. Chairman, that I have the honor to serve as a member of the committee that today reports an appropriation of \$200,000 to be used in addition to the amount now on hand for that purpose.

This is not a matter affecting the Pacific States alone. Even if it were, that would be a sufficient reason for enacting this measure. But unless the bars are put up strongly and permanently against this Chinese invasion they will overwhelm not only our West, but also our whole country. There are 400,000,000 of them, one-third of the population of the whole earth. What, with their enormous numbers, their capacity for hard work, and their ability to live on almost nothing, they constitute in sober earnest the most deadly peril of Western and Christian civilization to-day. Our only safety, Mr. Chairman, consists in shutting them out and keeping them out. This is what this bill proposes to do, and that is why I am in favor of it. I trust sincerely that the bill will be passed and become law at the earliest possible date, and before the 1st day of May. [Applause.]

Mr. BENTON. Mr. Chairman, I will not take up much time on this bill. Before I say anything about the provisions of this bill I desire, in answer to some inquiries of my colleague from Missouri, to discuss now for a moment and to make an explanation on District matters. The Subcommittee on Appropriations having in charge the District bill convened ten weeks ago with the intention of having hearings and reporting the bill for the District to Congress; and if the Commissioners of the District of Columbia had asked for the ordinary amount of money the bill perhaps would have been out of the Senate before this time. The Commissioners came in, and their recommendations covered something like ten and a half millions of dollars.

On investigating the amount of revenue which the District could raise by taxation on the subjects of taxation which had heretofore been used, we found that three and a half million dollars was about all they raised in the District by taxation, and under a former statute, the Government appropriating the same amount, that it aggregated about \$7,000,000, and more than that would be outside of our authority to appropriate. The subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations called the Commissioners together and insisted to them that while their recommendations for the interests of the District were probably correct, yet in view of the fact that we were only authorized to appropriate so much as they raised by taxation, that we preferred to defer the taking up and passing the appropriation bill for the District until they had made some efforts through the proper committees of this House and at the other end of the Capitol, to wit, the Committees on the District of Columbia, to raise by taxation a sufficient amount of money that would authorize us to appropriate more money than we had appropriated in bills heretofore.

So that the Committee on Appropriations or its subcommittee on the District of Columbia appropriation bill have waited to see what would be done, because it is our determination—and I believe the full committee will indorse the feeling of the subcommittee—not to appropriate any more money than double the amount the District raises by taxation. The question was raised in the District subcommittee two years ago as to why personal property was not taxed in the District of Columbia. It was intimated to us very broadly that it was the desire of the citizenship of the District to invite gentlemen of wealth to come here and make homes, indicating to them that if they would build a fine home here they would be taxed reasonably on their real property and that their personal property would escape taxation.

In other words, it was an apparent bid to bring wealth here on the suggestion, if not the promise, that it would not be taxed. We know something of the necessities of the District when we know what sort of water we have been drinking, and we know that a filtration plant ought to be made for the District, costing about a million of dollars. We were just as anxious to meet the requirements of the District as the Commissioners were, but we were just as determined, so far as our committee was concerned, that something ought to be done looking toward the taxation of personality and real property in the District in some manner that would be nearer its worth than in the past, and it is because we desire those things done that the District bill has not been reported.

Mr. RUCKER. Can the gentleman inform us when the District appropriation bill will be reported?

Mr. BENTON. We have no information at all to give, because we would rather await the action of Congress as to whether they would authorize taxation of personal property. The Committee on Appropriations, all of them, and I know distinctly that I would not want to agree to issue bonds or a loan. We would rather they would raise the money by taxation.

Mr. RUCKER. You say that you would rather that the District raise the money than issue bonds?

Mr. BENTON. I will not vote for the issuance of bonds at all.

Mr. RUCKER. Has a bill been introduced in the Senate taxing personal property in this District?

Mr. BENTON. I think so.

Mr. RUCKER. As I learn through the papers, everything that relates to District legislation is referred to the Commissioners of the District for their revision and modification.

Mr. BENTON. That is not true so far as the appropriations are concerned. We revise and often modify their estimates.

Mr. RUCKER. I only make that statement based on newspaper reports.

Mr. BENTON. It may be that the District Commissioners are advised with by the Committee on the District of Columbia. They are advised with by us. They make their estimates and we revise them afterwards.

Mr. HEPBURN. I would like to ask the gentleman a question, if he will yield.

Mr. BENTON. Yes.

Mr. HEPBURN. And that is, during the investigation upon this subject that you have referred to, was there any information furnished your committee as to the probable number of millions of property that escaped taxation in the District because of the failure to tax personal property?

Mr. BENTON. Not that I might put in the RECORD as certain, though I have a very fair idea.

Mr. HEPBURN. Would the gentleman object to stating it?

Mr. BENTON. I think from the best estimate I could make it would reach \$250,000,000.

Mr. HEPBURN. That is not now taxed?

Mr. BENTON. That is the best estimate that I can make.

Mr. RUCKER. Is that \$250,000,000 personal or real estate?

Mr. BENTON. Both.

Mr. RUCKER. What part of it is personal?

Mr. BENTON. More than one-half; probably two-thirds.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I would like to make a suggestion to the gentleman. Appropriate to the matter now occupying the gentleman's attention and which he has discussed, I only want to call to his attention one case. This is a matter not only interesting to the people of the District of Columbia, but to the people throughout the whole country. An instance came to my attention within a year and a half or two years prior to this time where a resident of the District had his hundred and some odd thousand dollars loaned out in a single county in the State of Indiana, but he pays no taxes in the District and he pays no taxes in Indiana. I hope if the gentleman has the power he will have the disposition to correct that evil in providing for taxation of personal property in the District.

Mr. KLUTTZ. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I have no time to yield. The gentleman from Missouri yielded to me.

Mr. BENTON. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KLUTTZ. Does not the gentleman know as a matter of common report that a great many millionaires have moved to Washington to dodge taxation of personal property?

Mr. BENTON. I do not know it. It would be a mere matter of opinion if I said yes. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to defer any discussion of this matter until the District bill came before us.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Missouri will allow me, is it not true that the Committee on Appropriations has nothing to do with enacting the law under which taxes are assessed?

Mr. BENTON. Nothing whatever.

Mr. HEMENWAY. That matter belongs to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BENTON. It belongs to the committee that has legislation in charge. We only appropriate what we have got in sight; and I believe the Committee on Appropriations is of one mind on that subject, and that is that the property in the District of Columbia ought to be assessed at a fair valuation, whether it is real or personal, as it is in the States.

Mr. KEHOE. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield to me for a question?

Mr. BENTON. Certainly.

Mr. KEHOE. According to the fair value of property, which is of the greater value, the property of the Government or the property of the individuals in the District?

Mr. BENTON. The property of the individuals, clearly. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say just a word to members on this side of the House about this bill that is before us. The subcommittee of appropriations on the sundry civil bill had the benefit of the long experience of the chairman of the committee in its investigation. We were about this bill three weeks, and I believe we made as good a bill as we could under the circumstances.

I have been asked the question sometimes by members of Congress, privately, why certain appropriations are larger than would

appear to be necessary from the day-to-day expenditures. My answer to that is this: Whenever we appropriate money it is to be in accordance with established law. If we appropriate at any time what seems to be large sums or unnecessary sums, it is not the fault of the Committee on Appropriations. It comes from legislation which Congress has already enacted, which makes continuing appropriations necessary.

Now, this is a very representative and a very fair bill. It appropriates nearly \$13,000,000 less than the last bill. Of course, we do not think for a moment that we are going to get it through Congress in any such condition. This bill as presented here appropriates \$12,500,000 less than the current fiscal year, and is, in the opinion of the Committee on Appropriations, what is necessary, and at least fairly liberal; but when the bill is made up and is settled in conference my opinion is that it will be as large as the current law.

But the bill as presented by the Committee on Appropriations is in their opinion amply sufficient for the purposes for which the appropriations are made. Just one other point. There appears to be a considerable increase in one item to which I called the chairman's attention, and that is for the finishing up of the work in the Yellowstone Park. Your committee were of the opinion that one of two things ought to be done: Either we ought to quit the park entirely, or finish up the public work and make the roads through it, put them in good state of preservation—and we decided to do it. It is not in the opinion of the committee extravagant, but if we are going to hold the park, it is a work of necessity. One word about the proposed building for use of members. I think that it should be the first of the proposed buildings in this city. I stand ready to vote for the appropriation when it is offered in the House. Mr. Chairman, I now yield an hour to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BELL].

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. GROSVENOR having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On March 31, 1902:

- H. R. 2123. An act granting a pension to Elizabeth M. Folds;
- H. R. 2669. An act granting a pension to Isabella Compton;
- H. R. 3769. An act granting a pension to Susan Terry;
- H. R. 3873. An act granting an increase of pension to William C. Flowers;
- H. R. 5073. An act granting a pension to Christina Daniels;
- H. R. 6487. An act granting a pension to Kazier Washburn;
- H. R. 7846. An act granting a pension to Michael Tynan;
- H. R. 7968. An act granting a pension to Norris L. Lungren;
- H. R. 8292. An act granting a pension to Hester Thomas;
- H. R. 9296. An act granting a pension to Mary E. Chapman;
- H. R. 4456. An act granting a pension to Ruth B. Osborne;
- H. R. 5289. An act granting a pension to Malvina C. Stith;
- H. R. 6018. An act granting a pension to Lue Emma McJunkin;
- H. R. 7074. An act granting a pension to Benjamin F. Draper;
- H. R. 8293. An act granting a pension to Amanda Jacko;
- H. R. 9397. An act granting a pension to John S. Lewis;
- H. R. 1325. An act granting an increase of pension to William J. Wallace;
- H. R. 2547. An act granting an increase of pension to William M. Guy;
- H. R. 2786. An act granting an increase of pension to William K. Koffman;
- H. R. 4468. An act granting an increase of pension to John B. Kurth;
- H. R. 5109. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick M. Hahn;
- H. R. 6864. An act granting an increase of pension to Milton A. Embick;
- H. R. 7320. An act granting an increase of pension to James Mantach;
- H. R. 7424. An act granting an increase of pension to John Craig;
- H. R. 7771. An act granting an increase of pension to Frank Seaman;
- H. R. 10132. An act granting an increase of pension to John Garner;
- H. R. 10956. An act granting an increase of pension to Frances K. Morrison;
- H. R. 1529. An act granting an increase of pension to John G. Brower;
- H. R. 2673. An act granting an increase of pension to John Vale;
- H. R. 3272. An act granting an increase of pension to Israel P. Covey;
- H. R. 4488. An act granting an increase of pension to Selden E. Whitcher;

H. R. 5543. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Skinner;

H. R. 7823. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob D. Caldwell;

H. R. 9227. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick Shafer;

H. R. 11145. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Key; and

H. R. 3278. An act to correct the military record of C. R. Dickson. On March 29, 1902:

S. 4260. An act to correct the military record of James A. Somerville; and

H. J. Res. 171. Joint resolution for appointment of members of board of managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

On March 31, 1902:

H. R. 3136. An act for a public building for a marine-hospital at Pittsburgh, Pa.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I am in the unfortunate condition of being compelled to talk about measures that are not before this House. I have rarely, if ever, done such a thing before, and I very much regret it now; but, from the condition of the House itself and its peculiar workings, if any member of this House desires to discuss any great question that comes before it he must do it either prior to the hearing or after the bill has actually passed this body.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment one of the most, if not the most, important questions that is before the American people to-day, or should be before the American people, is to recover the House of Representatives from the low condition in which it has fallen.

Sir, we may shut our eyes as much as we will, but it is in everybody's mouth to-day, whether Democrat, Republican, Prohibitionist, or whoever he may be, that the House of Representatives signifies nothing in the American régime of government. A few days ago I was very much impressed by finding a Republican newspaper from the great State of Pennsylvania, one from the great State of California, and one from the District of Columbia sounding this warning at one and the same time. I want to read a little of these opinions, and I will begin with the Washington Post of this city:

One reason, doubtless, why Representatives are so anxious to be Senators is that the House has ceased to be a deliberative body, but is controlled by a junta that dictates what shall and what shall not be done, while the Senate is preeminently a deliberative body of 90 ambassadors from half as many sovereign Commonwealths. As far as deliberation is concerned, the House that was presided over by GALUSHA A. GROW was as different from the House that is presided over by DAVID B. HENDERSON as the Roman senate that offered for public sale the ground on which was encamped Hannibal's victorious army differed from the Roman senate that confirmed the purchase of the imperial purple. It will not always be so. The mutterings and murmurings presage the coming of a storm that none can resist.

That is from a paper published in our midst, that watches you and watches me and watches these proceedings every day. About the same day from San Francisco comes this editorial:

The leaders of the House of Representatives appear in the curious attitude of persons bent upon the destruction of their own importance. Absolute power over the presentation, discussion, and amendment of measures has been given to the Speaker and the Committee on Rules; and this coterie of less than half a dozen men entirely dominates all proceedings in the House of Representatives. It decides what shall be considered, for how long, and by whom; and the precise force of any measure is determined in advance.

Deliberation under this method of procedure comes out of the question, and discussion sinks to the level of mere mechanical utterance, so far as it affects the House of Representatives. Such a deliberate self-abasement of a great legislative body is without a parallel in the history of the world. It is the Senate—sometimes called "the Millionaires' Club"—which now deliberates and legislates, and the country recognizes the fact, whilst the House itself concedes it. It has become the one branch of Congress which now regularly determines the course and character of deliberation. No issue is now ever joined with it and no fight ever made against it. The fate that has now well-nigh overtaken the House is a singular one in so great a Republic and well worthy of the study of the political philosopher.

A few days ago in a bunch of the bright newspaper men gathered at this capital, one who had been here over twenty years advocating Republicanism stood in his place and said: "A few years ago every principal newspaper man in Washington crowded into the House of Representatives; the inferior ones stayed in the Senate. But," said he, "to-day no experienced newspaper man ever cares anything about the House of Representatives. It is no longer considered a deliberative body." And a Republican of national reputation, whose position is in the other Chamber, said: "Yes; you may talk about the deleterious effects of the steel trust; you may talk about the injuries of the railroad trusts; you may talk about the injuries of the sugar trust; but I will tell you the most dangerous trust in America to-day is the legislative trust that is placed in a few hands in the House of Representatives and is breaking down all of the powers and the principles upon which it was built."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want this morning to talk about the three financial bills that have been reported to this House or ap-

proved by the Republican members. And why do I bring this question before the House at this hour? It is because you know and because I know that there has not been a question upon which parties differed in principle for years that has been debated or that has been permitted to be debated on this floor. We are begged to debate when some matter of no importance is up. We are deprived of debate, we are deprived of the opportunity of amendment, we are deprived of discussion when a great question comes up in this forum for final consideration.

When the bill to strike down the sugar industry of this country, which will come before us in a few days, you will see it put through with whip and spur; and no man who is interested in that great question will be permitted to amend that bill or discuss it. Therefore we are forced prematurely to come here and say what we wish to say about these questions before the proper time, or after it, or not at all. But, thank God, we can ask the sugar growers of twenty States what they think of a party that takes the tariff off the things they produce at the dictation of a gigantic sugar trust and leaves it on everything they buy. We can hang out the insignia of the astute General Dick: "Here is our free trade for the farmer and here is the protection for the sugar trust." We shall also try to find some way to inform them that we were gagged and could not debate or offer an amendment. In my judgment we have now pending before this body three of the most dangerous bills, taking them together, that ever were presented before this body in the history of this Government.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. May I remind the gentleman that he has failed to call the attention of the House and the country to the responsibility of the Republican party for the condition that prevails here with reference to the rules and the Committee on Rules?

Mr. BELL. The country knows who is responsible for that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Democratic party for a number of years past has been charged as being currency "tinkerers." We had a great campaign on what the politicians on the stump called the silver question. I never discussed it from that standpoint in this body or upon the stump. Nobody that ever understood our side of the question ever discussed it in this body or on the stump as the silver question. We all realized that the point at issue was not whether you should have silver, or gold, or paper. The issue was shall we have an abundance of Government money issued and controlled by the Government for all the people or bank paper controlled by the banks for the banks.

The historian Hume says:

In every kingdom into which money begins to flow in greater abundance than formerly everything takes on a new face for greater prosperity.

Henri Cernuschi, the eminent French financier, says:

The value of money depends upon its quantity. The purchasing power is always in relation to its quantity.

The political economist Ricardo says:

That commodities would rise and fall in price in proportion to the increase or diminution of money, I assume as a fact that is incontrovertible.

The whole philosophy of the silver question is that gold, silver, and paper issued by the Government is safer than mere bank promises to pay, of which we now have \$300,000,000 in our circulation, and an effort is now being made to double it.

The following bill is put forth as the Republican idea of a financial panacea, with a unanimous report of Republican members, viz:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to coin the silver bullion in the Treasury purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, into such denominations of subsidiary silver coin as he may deem necessary to meet public requirements, and thereafter, as public necessities may demand, to recoin silver dollars into subsidiary coin; and so much of any act as fixes a limit to the aggregate of subsidiary silver coin outstanding, and so much of any act as directs the coinage of any portion of the bullion purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, into standard silver dollars, is hereby repealed.

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to maintain at all times at parity with gold the legal-tender silver dollars remaining outstanding; and to that end he is hereby directed to exchange gold for legal-tender silver dollars when presented to the Treasury in the sum of \$5 or any multiple thereof; and all provisions of law for the use or maintenance of the reserve fund in the Treasury relating to United States notes are, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, hereby made applicable to the exchange of legal-tender silver dollars.

The question at issue still is whether you should have money issued by the Government in full and necessary quantity or whether you should leave it to the banks of the country to issue the money and contract or expand it at will. Now, our contention and the pith of the contention of all of the so-called silver men has ever been based upon the quantitative theory of money. We have always contended and now contend, and the Republican party now agrees with us, that we must keep up an equilibrium between the amount of property to be exchanged and the amount of money with which to make those exchanges, and therefore we, in common with all the economists who have gone before us, including our Secretaries of the Treasury from time to time, have said that all these panics have been occasioned by the scarcity and not by the abundance of money; and I lay down another proposition, that in no case has there been a question raised as to the form of the money in times of panic, but in every case the clamor has been for money of any kind or any quality whatever.

You will generally find in one of these measures a small amount of good, a mere crumb for the people, and it climaxes with the colossal lion's share shuffled into the already bursting coffers of the money changers.

This bill provides for the very proper raise of the limit of subsidiary coin from \$100,000,000 to \$120,000,000. This subsidiary coin does not invade the domain of the national-bank notes or bonds, hence this comforting crumb is cheerfully extended to the masses of the people.

In 1900 the limit of subsidiary coin in the United States was \$80,000,000. Owing to the great increase of our bank currency and gold coinage, together with the new trade coming from our own consumption and also the new trade from England for her Boer war, we were required to raise the limit on our divisional or minor coins from \$80,000,000 to \$100,000,000 to accommodate our greatly increased domestic trade. Our great and increasing coining of gold and our increased trade continues, and the Director of the Mint has requested an additional raise of the limit of our subsidiary coins of \$20,000,000 more, to \$120,000,000—equaling the astonishing increase of 50 per cent in our necessity for small change in the space of two years.

It is commendable that this requirement is supplied in the bill. The very fact that we now require 50 per cent more small change than we did before these wars, before our marvelous crops at home and the great droughts abroad, and before the mighty stimulus given to trade by the enormous increase in our gold coinage and the great increase in our per capita circulation, establishes the pressing necessity for a like increase in our general currency. Does this bill provide for such an increase or permit the natural increase now going on? Nay, verily; but, on the contrary, it seeks to shrink the volume of real money in the enormous sum of over \$500,000,000, or to the extent of our present amount of coined silver dollars. But, say the authors of this ungenerous shuffle of the wealth of the people into the pockets of the bankers and bondholders, "We do not destroy the silver dollar; we simply enable the people to take it to the Treasury and convert it into gold." My dear sirs, the people do not want to convert it into gold, and you know it. That means that you purpose to convert a silver dollar into a mere order to pay it in gold, or reduce our real money to the amount of your gold stock. Under the law a holder may now take gold to the Treasury, deposit it, and receive gold certificates for it. At any future time he can return the gold certificates and get back the gold coin. All of this time, however, the Treasury must keep the gold in the vaults for the payment of the certificate.

This act, if passed, would not only leave the outstanding certificate above described against the gold dollar, but every one of the 500,000,000 and odd silver dollars would be converted into gold certificates, redeemable in the exact manner as gold certificates are redeemable, and would put \$2 in certificates for each gold dollar for its redemption.

We now hold in the Treasury continually \$150,000,000 in gold to secure the redemption of probably \$335,000,000 greenbacks (nominally \$346,000,000, but with destruction and loss there is nothing approaching \$346,000,000) and Treasury notes. This great sum of unused money in the hands of the people at the low rate of 3 per cent would be worth \$9,000,000 per annum.

If this bill should pass what would be the result? At the very next session of Congress the "currency tinkers" would be here backed by the great banking interests of the world and a subservient press demanding that the gold reserve be raised to \$300,000,000 to secure the payment of the silver dollars in gold. They will get it, as they have everything else they have demanded in modern times, and there will be piled up in the Treasury, or more probably in the national banks, idle money to the amount of \$300,000,000, worth, at 3 per cent, \$9,000,000.

The "currency tinkers" for the past forty years have worked in and out of season for the banking and bondholding interests alone, and these especially favored ones have made untold millions out of these machinations, and in every instance in the inverse ratio the laborers and general producers have been plundered.

Many times during the existence of this Government we have had financial panics, every one of which is attributable to the shrinkage or limitation of the power of the currency, or to the "tinkers" with the currency. No panic has ever passed away without a pathetic trail of devastation among debtors, ordinary producers, and laborers which was heartrending. But few panics, if any, have ever visited any country that the great bond and mortgage holding and the great banking portion of the people were not financially benefited. The small banks and the small financial institutions have always been caught in the wreckage. The great panic of 1837 occurred during Van Buren's Administration, and is rightly attributed to a tinkering with the currency. Daniel Webster ascribed the panic to the interference of the Government with the currency, and to what was known as the "specie circular," requiring all public lands to be paid for in specie.

On May 10, 1837, all of the banks of New York suspended payment, and devastation and wreckage of values were rife everywhere except among the powerful money-owning and money-lending institutions of the country that defied the public and the people by suspending payment.

Prof. W. G. Sumner, of Yale, in his History of American Currency, states that nearly all of the banks made money out of the suspension and paid big dividends during the year.

The panic of 1857 was brought on largely by the "tinkers" with currency in Congress. Prior to 1857 all of the gold coins and most of the silver coins of foreign nations were full legal tender in the United States. Gold had been overvalued by an act of Congress, and in consequence great quantities of foreign gold accumulated in the United States, and much of it was held as bank reserves, was of light weight, and was depreciated in bullion value. In February, 1857, Congress demonetized all foreign coins without supplying anything to fill the vacuum. The coins were usually of such light weight that they could not be profitably converted into American coins, were exported never to return, which brought on the panic and spread ruin again to all classes except the owners of bonds, mortgages, and ready money. The shrinkage in the volume of the currency greatly enhanced the value of ready money and gilt-edged bonds and securities, and in an inverse ratio depreciated the value of labor and of all other property, to the ruin of producers and laborers.

The awful panic of 1873 was brought on by the currency "tinkers," who persistently demanded the unnecessary retirement of the great volume of greenbacks without providing anything to fill their places. In a speech in the Senate, January 27, 1869, when the currency "tinkers" were strenuously demanding a more rapid retirement of the greenback, Hon. John Sherman, before he became a great bank-stock investor and when he was known throughout the country as plain, honest John Sherman, said:

It is not possible to take this voyage without the sorest distress. To every person except a capitalist out of debt or a salaried officer or annuitant it is a period of loss, danger, lassitude of trade, fall of wages, suspension of enterprise, bankruptcy, and disaster, and it means the ruin of dealers whose debts are twice their business capital, though one-third less than their actual property. It means the fall of all agricultural productions without any great reduction of taxes. When that day comes all enterprise will be suspended, every bank will have contracted its currency to the lowest limit, and the debtor, compelled to meet in coin a debt contracted in currency, will find the coin hoarded in the Treasury, no representative of coin in circulation, his property shrunk, not only to the extent of the depreciation of the currency, but still more by the artificial scarcity made by the holders of gold.

He declared that the proposed retirement of the greenback to the extent proposed "would be an act of folly without an example in evil in modern times." (Cong. Globe, 1869, p. 629.)

Notwithstanding all of the timely warning, the currency "tinkers" never ceased until they brought on that awful panic of 1873, that reduced labor to idleness and want and pauperized the debtors all over this land, and enriched those solvent money, bond, and mortgage holders by a forced conveyance of the property of the debtors into the hands of the capitalistic classes at from 25 per cent to 50 per cent of its true value.

When the financial skies began to clear in 1874 and honest men with sad hearts began to view the spectacle and to right the true causes of the lamentable disaster, ruin, and misery which it had left in its trail, Hon. John A. Logan, March 17, 1874, graphically, and with a sad heart, said upon the floor of the United States Senate:

But, sir, that the panic (1873) was not due to the character of the currency is proved by the history of the panic itself. * * * No, sir, the panic was not attributable to the character of the currency, but to a money famine, and to nothing else. In the very midst of the panic we saw the leading bankers and business men of New York pressing and urging the President and the Secretary of the Treasury to let loose twenty or twenty-five millions more of the same paper for their relief. * * * Why is it that Representatives forget the interests of their own section and stand up here as the advocates of the gold brokers and money lenders and sharks, the same class of men whose tables Christ turned over and whom He lashed out of the temple at Jerusalem. Sir, turn this matter as we will and look at it from any side whatever, and it does present the appearance of being a stupendous scheme of the money holders to seize the opportunity of placing under their control the vast industries of the nation. Therefore, I warn Senators against pushing too far the great conflict now going on between capital and labor.

The diabolical panic of 1893, properly designated as the "bankers' panic," was the most unnecessary and cruel thing that was ever precipitated upon an innocent and confiding people. This, too, was brought on by the pestiferous currency "tinkers." Senator Sherman and others had sounded the alarm by stating in the Senate that the present national banking system would soon go out of existence, because the Government bonds would be paid off, leaving no basis for a national-bank circulation. The national bankers got together, concluded to have the purchasing clause of the Sherman act repealed and thereby stop the issue of Treasury notes monthly for silver purchasers; stop the coinage of silver and force a bank-note currency and an issue of long-time interest-bearing bonds upon the people, for banking purposes.

The National Bankers' Association issued a confidential circular letter to the bankers throughout the United States, telling them that Senator Sherman would introduce a bill to repeal the

purchasing clause of the Sherman act, for them to see their member of Congress immediately curtail loans and circulation of bank notes for a time, and they could secure the passage of the bill. A crusade of intimidation and currency squeeze was begun that drove the people to hoarding, the banks and business men to withdrawing credits, culminating in the most disastrous panic that ever cursed this nation.

Robert Ingersoll, the great campaigner of the Republican party, immediately christened it the "bankers' panic." He said:

This is a bankers' panic. They have been predicting a panic for years, and have done all they could to fulfill the prediction.

Senator David B. Hill, of New York, from their very midst, and contemporaneous with the panic, declared it the bankers' legitimate offspring. From the floor of the United States Senate he said:

With ghoulish glee they welcomed every bank failure, especially in the silver States, little dreaming that such failures would soon occur at their own doors. They encouraged the hoarding of money; they inaugurated the policy of refusing loans to the people, even upon the best security; they circulated false propositions; passed absurd and alarming resolutions; predicted the direst disaster; attacked the credit of the Government; sought to exact a premium on currency, and attempted in every way to spread distrust broadcast throughout the land. The best organized financial system in the world could not stand such an organized and vicious attack upon it. These disturbers, these promoters of the public peril, represent largely the creditor class.

This panic was not caused by any objection among the people to any form of money. The Secretary of the Treasury showed at the time that the people generally had lost confidence in the banks and were drawing out and hoarding their money, but without complaint accepted silver, silver certificates, Treasury notes, greenbacks, or bank notes. The very silver dollars that the bankers feigned to fear went to a premium in New York of \$2.50 per thousand during the panic.

If the customs of some members of this House do not cease, in the early morning of this bright, new century the deadly upas of another blighting panic will lie at the doors of the pestiferous "currency tinkers," done in the interests of the cormorants that have already confiscated the wealth of the nation through cunningly throwing the people into inextricable complications. Whether these alert gentlemen bring this about unwittingly or premeditatedly, the direful effects will be equally excruciating.

Mr. SIBLEY. What was the date of that circular?

Mr. BELL. It was in August, 1893.

Now, sir, the Secretary of the Treasury in his last report speaks of this awful panic. He says practically the same thing about the instability of banks in panicky times. Secretary Gage, on page 76, in speaking of the panic of 1893, says:

We have not far to look to see this well illustrated. The panic of 1893 is a marked example. Within a period of less than twelve months bank credits (deposits) were contracted to a total of more than \$400,000,000—

Think of it—

while the actual cash holdings of the banks were increased by nearly \$50,000,000.

Think of it. The banks increased their own money in their vaults \$50,000,000 within twelve months and withdrew \$400,000,000 in credits during the panic of 1893.

That is to say a volume of bank credits before available for transfer in the ordinary channels of trade was suddenly diverted to the payment of pre-existing indebtedness from the public to the banks. This is shown by the fact that "loans and discounts" were reduced during the period to an amount substantially corresponding to the fall in deposits.

These bills, if passed, mean the destruction of over \$500,000,000 of silver in the United States. It not only means that, but it means the contraction of the currency when the population of this country is growing more rapidly than ever before during its history, increasing the population, doubling the wealth, and cutting down the money supply. The Secretary of the Treasury calls attention to the fact that there must be an increase in the currency, for the purpose of expanding, for the benefit of this new population, and he suggests that there should be at least an expansion of \$300,000,000, but he suggests bank paper.

Now they have introduced and reported a second bill as bad as the first. It takes in all the propositions of the first except the exchange of gold for silver. Now, then, I come to the third bill, known as the banking bill, the most infamous and dangerous bill ever introduced in this House or in the other Chamber, and I will not forego or except any other bills in their radical tendency that were ever introduced anywhere. This so-called banking bill means the absolute slavery of every industry in this country. Have you thought of it; have you looked at it? But let us see what this bill is and what it proposes to do. The first object is to create a division of banking and currency—three good, fat offices with salaries of \$7,500 per annum. Very good so far as it goes. They are to hold office for twelve years. A nice berth!

What else does it provide? It provides that these men will assume the redemption of one hundred and thirty million of these outstanding notes, although so much deprecated; that they shall issue banking currency on their capital stock to their full value finally. They start in by gradations of 10 per cent one year, 10

per cent another year, and 10 per cent another year, and they finally get up to the point where they set aside all the paper currency issued by the Government, as good as the Government that issues it, and then it must be followed with banking paper issued by these gentlemen, not on United States bonds, but it must be issued on the capital stock, and not only be issued on the capital stock, but the Secretary of the Treasury asks the Government to refuse further to guarantee these notes. Let the people go.

Now, my friends, we are going very rapidly. Since this banking system was organized, in 1865, there has been 404 failures of national banks. But these national banks could not issue circulation except up to 90 per cent of the bonds underlying them, and yet the people of the United States have had 404 of these banks fail, and up to the end of last year people have been deprived of over \$40,000,000 of their hard-earned money by the failure of these banks, when they had only the right of issuing circulation up to 90 per cent of their United States bonds.

In 1900, according to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, there were over 100 national banks in the hands of receivers, and yet in March, 1900, we gave them the right to issue circulation up to the full par value of their bonds. We allowed them to issue 10 per cent more currency than before, notwithstanding 404 of these institutions had gone under since 1865.

They cleaned up last year and put, I think it was, 26 out of business, with a loss to the people of over \$1,000,000. I want to show you the danger. As I have contended often before, this Government never intended that a professional banker should be at the head of the Treasury Department. The national-bank law requires now that certain officers of the Government who deal with imports and exports shall not be an importer or exporter, and neither shall they have stock in any concern while holding one of the lower positions—I believe it is one of the officers represented under and appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury—and it created great comment when Secretary McCulloch was put in at the head of the Treasury in war times.

Bankers are as good as other men. The banker looks at finance from one standpoint, he studies it from one standpoint, and the political economist studies it from another. What do we have? Prior to the present Secretary of the Treasury, we had a man who was at the time of his appointment, as I remember, the president of the National Bankers' Association of the United States, and he asks in his report that we turn this Government soul and body over to the bankers of the United States.

Now, there is no guessing about that, and yet he shows the utter inefficiency of the banks. At page 74 of his recent report he says:

The function and office of a bank is to give its money obligations in exchange for the money obligations of its customers and dealers. This is the business the bank chiefly prosecutes.

He shows that there is but little money handled by banks; that they sell their credit and they lend their credit, and he demonstrates it here, and he goes on to say:

This is made plain by a glance at the reports furnished by the banks to the office of the Comptroller of the Currency. At the period of their last report the national banks, as a whole, held obligations against the public to an amount in excess of \$3,018,000,000.

Think of it! now, \$3,018,000,000, while the public enjoyed a total of credits upon the books of the banks to an amount in excess of \$3,044,000,000.

That was \$800,000,000 more than all the money there is in the United States. They had credits on their books, supposed to be on deposit, of \$3,018,000,000, or \$800,000,000 more than all the money in the United States. The Secretary logically says that they do not deal in money, but they simply lend their credit to the individual. Now, what does he want us to do? He says the banking laws are not made for storm; they are made only for fair weather, and he tells us that the banking facilities will not take care of the public in a storm, but it will in fair weather.

Now, what does he want done? He wants you to give over to the banks full power to issue and control all paper money.

I want to show you where the Secretary of the Treasury himself admits and warns us that the banks will not take care of us whenever we have trouble. It is all right in clear weather. Says the Secretary of the Treasury:

No sooner do the symptoms of financial and business trouble appear than the banks, under the rule of self-preservation, suspend to the farthest limit possible their operations of loaning and discounting. They cease to give credit on their books in exchange for debt obligations from their dealers. The daily creation of the necessary medium of exchange—banking credits—ceases or becomes entirely inadequate to the commercial requirements.

The daily natural liquidation of credits continues, resulting in contraction. Business men carrying goods and securities, by aid of the bank credit, are obliged to sell with little regard to cost. Contemplated enterprises are abandoned; orders for future delivery of goods are rescinded. And as these successive steps mark the downward movement, the banker becomes the more reluctant to perform his important function of loaning his credits for commercial and industrial uses.

We thus perceive that the bracing support which had prompted and sustained business progress, without which indeed such progress would have been impossible, is withdrawn at the very moment when the supply is the most needed.

That is the position we take. Your banks are all right in fair weather; in storm they help the crisis.

Mr. MADDOX. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BELL. Certainly.

Mr. MADDOX. I do not want to interrupt the line of the gentleman's argument, but I do want to ask some questions in regard to one matter which I find in this bill.

Mr. BELL. I do not want to discuss the bill now. For the present I want to consume my time on other questions. I hope the gentleman will excuse me.

Now, the Secretary of the Treasury contends that we have not money enough, notwithstanding that the bank bill that I have been reading provides that the silver coinage shall be stopped. It provides that all the paper money of the Government shall be canceled. It provides that the bullion in the Treasury shall be held only for subsidiary coin. Yet the Secretary of the Treasury says that we have not the necessary currency; and he suggests the way in which we shall get it; that is, through the banks.

I read further from the language of the Secretary:

It is safe, I think, to estimate that in three years the total capital of national banks, if allowed to issue currency on their capital stock, would increase from the present amount of \$663,000,000 to \$1,000,000,000. With the right to issue circulating notes to par of their capital there would be the possibility of increasing the paper-money supply as population increased by the difference in amount between the present supply (greenbacks and bank notes both included) of, say, \$706,000,000 and \$1,000,000,000, or, in round numbers, \$300,000,000.

The Secretary says that our increased population requires this increase of the circulation, and he suggests an increase of \$300,000,000 in bank paper, and at the same time these banks are trying to contract the currency quite as much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BELL. I ask that I may be permitted to conclude my remarks. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENTON] suggested that I should have all the time that I wanted.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to finish his remarks.

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Now, Mr. Chairman, this banking bill which I propose to put into the RECORD provides for destroying the greenbacks issued by the Government and issuing a greenback by the banks themselves. In fact, they offer a piece of paper that is a copy of the old greenback itself. Again, they propose to pay interest at 1 per cent on the deposits of this Government in the banks and to force the money of the Government into their vaults. But they very adroitly provide that the interest on this currency shall be for the benefit of the banks themselves—shall be used to relieve them from the redemption of their currency and other matters of like importance.

I want to say just a word about the condition that is now going on and is proposed to be intensified by this bill. The proposition is to turn the industries of this Government, soul and body, over to the banks, they controlling the entire currency, and they are to do it simply on the capital stock of the banks themselves.

This being Monday, we have this morning, I believe, no Treasury report, but I believe I have the figures as given a day or so ago, and they show in the banks of the United States \$118,688,003.32.

What is that money worth on the market as shown by the rates that the States get for their money on deposit? Take, for instance, the State of Massachusetts as exhibiting about a fair average. According to the amount paid for the use of that money, the money the Government has now in the banks drawing no interest is worth over \$8,000 a day. That money on deposit has a market value as well established as the market value of corn or cotton or wheat.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] and I a couple of years ago got into a dispute. I said this money had as well established a value as any other commodity. He denied it. He said that the banks did not want it; that it was not profitable to them. I sat down that night and wrote to every State treasurer of the United States to ascertain what the funds of the various States were worth as a deposit, and I found by a return from the gentleman's own State of Connecticut that it had just drawn \$32,000 from the banks of Connecticut as 2 per cent interest on money upon deposit. I found that my friends from the State of Kansas, received from New York, are paying them 2 per cent on their deposits; found the great State of Massachusetts, the great State of New York, and everywhere else, drawing from 2 to 3½ per cent, and some States were paying as high as 4.

Mr. MANN. What do you mean by States paying?

Mr. BELL. I mean that the States let out their money to the banks just the same as they sell any other commodity.

Mr. MANN. Well, the banks were paying.

Mr. BELL. The banks were paying for the deposits. It generally run from 2 to 3½ per cent if it remained any length of time, and from 1½ to 2½ per cent on money subject to daily checks.

Mr. MANN. Has the gentleman made investigation as to how far the payment of interest on deposits of public moneys goes to the public owning the funds?

Mr. BELL. All except in a few States. There were a few States that did not pay their State treasurers anything of consequence, and the treasurers were supposed to get their salaries out of it. Some of the Southern States, I think, did not pay over \$800 or \$900.

Mr. MANN. It is an interesting question. In my own State we pay pretty good salaries to treasurers, and they keep the 2 per cent on bank deposits in addition.

Mr. BELL. The treasurers do?

Mr. MANN. I regret to say that the treasurers do. I understand the gentleman to say that generally the municipality or State owning the fund collects the interest.

Mr. BELL. The majority of the States draw the interest, and it runs from 4 per cent down.

Mr. MANN. Has the gentleman found whether there is any place where money of the National Government is deposited and where the banks receiving public funds do so without the payment of interest to somebody?

Mr. BELL. Nowhere; and that is where I say we are menial to the banks themselves.

Mr. MANN. I suppose the gentleman has no information that is definite as to whether anybody receives any interest on account of the deposit of national funds?

Mr. BELL. Oh, I do not know about that. During the great cry, when there were some \$20,000,000 in this bank over in New York and the bankers were making a row over it, they insisted, and the president of one of the great banking associations said, that money was worth 4 per cent to the banks; it was actually worth 4 per cent to the banks because it was permanent, and at that very minute New York on its canal funds, because they were somewhat permanent, received 3 per cent. I have all of the original letters yet. Pennsylvania draws interest, New York draws interest, Massachusetts draws interest, and every State, with a few rare exceptions, draws interest from deposits.

Mr. MANN. You mean the banks in those States—

Mr. BELL. I mean they make this money earn something.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman state what security these banks give before receiving the national deposit?

Mr. BELL. Just whatever they and the State powers agree upon.

Mr. SCOTT. I did not refer to the State deposits. I referred to the deposits of the National Government.

Mr. BELL. The National Treasury requires United States bonds, but there is no reason why they should not take any good security, as the States do. In this very bill that now has the approval of the banking association they are insisting on doing away with the bonds and issuing the money for this Government on their capital stock alone.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Is there not this difference between State deposits and national deposits? It is true, I think, that most of the States receive interest on deposits. I know in my State the State treasurer receives at the present time 2½ per cent on all deposits that he makes in national banks scattered over the State. The deposits are more or less permanent, so regarded; but with the United States deposits the United States Government requires the equivalent of United States bonds as additional security.

Mr. BELL. That simply means that a few shall have all the money.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. And the State has no security but the credit of the bank. The United States are secured by their own bonds.

Mr. COCHRAN. I think it is absolutely true that the States require security the same as the National Government does. I know mine does.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. I do not know how it is with your State.

Mr. COCHRAN. They require security.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Not usually. In New England the State treasurers have a right to deposit in any State or national institution.

Mr. BELL. During President Cleveland's Administration, President McKinley from this floor severely criticised President Cleveland's Administration, because he said at that minute there were lying in the banks of the country \$69,000,000 of the people's money, and that the people had a right to interest upon that money, and that President Cleveland's Administration allowed the banks to have it for nothing and to toll it back to the people at a high price. That was his view of it. But instead of there now being \$69,000,000 there are \$118,000,000 of this money in these banks that have the Government bonds. They get it for nothing and they lease it out to the people. In this banking bill they propose to let this money go into the banks, but it is only on bond securities, and therefore these big banks would get it.

Now, there is another thing about this banking bill that I want to speak of, and that is this: An effort has been made for many

years to get two provisions in the banking laws. One is to have a foreign provision, a provision for foreign banking, so that a combination may take a charter from this Government to go abroad with, an official prestige as it were, and exploit those countries, and probably have a war ship hanging around now and then at your expense and mine to protect their capital and their investments there. That is in this bill. It has been defeated by this House I do not know how many times. Since I have been here I know of one time. That is one provision.

Another provision for which they have been yearning for years has been the branch-bank system. The great central banks in New York and elsewhere have been clamoring for years that they may be allowed to have a great central bank in New York with branches all over the United States. When that system is established, then good-bye to the small banks everywhere. They become mere agents of these big banks, handling their money, hiring their currency from them, or go out of existence. It means death to the little banks. That is the object.

The little bank has got to serve the big one or go out of existence, and the fact is, it will go out of existence. That is provided for in this bill. They are to have the right both to take the prestige of this Government and go to Germany or England or anywhere

in foreign countries, with a quasi official title, to do banking, and I suppose our warships will hover around every time they get into a little trouble to protect United States investments. We are getting now too many men who are trying to go abroad. The idea now is entertained that this country is not good enough to live in, and day after day you find men are moving their families abroad, buying houses there, while ostensibly living here, or they themselves are going abroad.

It is pretty hard now to pass many days without seeing somebody who is just going abroad to remain. I notice this morning a very important gentleman has just sold out to go to the mother country—going to become a British citizen and live there because he likes it better than this country. Many are going, and when they do not become citizens of a foreign country, they will in fact move abroad and be only nominal American citizens. I think we should not encourage that in any particular. I here exhibit the increased circulation of gold and silver which accounts in a large measure for our phenomenal prosperity.

DEPOSITS OF GOLD SINCE 1873.

The value of the deposits of gold bullion, coin, and jewelers' bars at the mints and assay offices of the United States, by fiscal years, since 1873 is exhibited in the following table:

Deposits of gold at United States mints and assay offices since 1873.

Fiscal year ended June 30—	Character of gold deposited.					Total.
	Domestic bullion.	Domestic coin (coining value).	Foreign bullion.	Foreign coin (United States coining value).	Jewelers' bars, old plate, etc.	
1873	\$28,868,569.78	\$27,116,948.27	\$426,107.44	\$518,542.14	\$774,218.25	\$57,704,385.88
1874	29,736,387.82	6,275,367.29	3,162,519.92	9,313,882.47	654,353.56	49,142,511.06
1875	34,266,124.52	1,714,311.50	739,439.66	1,111,792.26	724,625.96	38,556,293.90
1876	37,590,529.39	417,947.15	1,141,905.76	2,111,083.80	681,819.32	41,943,285.42
1877	43,478,103.93	447,339.68	1,931,163.12	2,068,260.73	837,911.25	48,787,778.71
1878	48,075,123.76	301,021.79	2,068,679.05	1,316,461.09	907,932.20	52,609,217.89
1879	38,549,705.89	198,063.17	1,069,796.89	1,498,819.71	937,751.14	42,254,156.80
1880	35,821,705.40	206,328.82	21,200,997.23	40,426,559.63	1,176,505.77	98,835,096.85
1881	35,815,036.55	440,776.97	37,771,472.26	55,462,885.74	1,943,430.93	130,833,102.45
1882	31,288,511.97	569,356.80	12,783,807.04	20,304,810.78	1,770,166.36	66,756,652.95
1883	32,481,642.38	374,129.23	4,727,143.22	6,906,083.80	1,858,107.42	46,347,106.05
1884	29,079,596.33	263,117.17	6,023,734.45	9,095,461.45	1,864,769.26	46,326,678.66
1885	31,584,436.64	325,210.97	11,221,846.45	7,893,217.77	1,869,363.26	52,894,075.09
1886	32,456,493.64	393,545.28	4,317,068.27	5,673,565.04	2,069,077.00	44,909,749.23
1887	32,973,027.41	516,984.63	22,571,328.70	9,896,512.28	2,265,219.85	68,223,072.87
1888	32,406,306.59	492,512.60	21,741,042.44	14,596,885.03	2,988,750.90	72,225,497.56
1889	31,440,778.93	585,066.87	2,136,516.66	4,447,475.99	3,526,597.31	42,136,435.76
1890	30,474,900.25	655,474.96	2,691,932.29	5,298,773.93	3,542,013.83	42,663,065.26
1891	31,555,116.85	583,847.16	4,054,822.86	8,256,303.80	4,035,710.15	48,485,800.82
1892	31,961,545.11	557,967.86	10,935,154.69	14,040,187.70	3,636,603.68	61,131,400.04
1893	33,286,167.94	792,470.43	2,247,730.78	6,293,296.33	3,830,176.02	46,443,841.50
1894	38,696,951.40	2,063,615.46	15,614,118.19	12,386,406.81	3,118,421.45	71,809,513.31
1895	44,371,949.83	1,188,258.21	14,108,438.74	2,278,614.07	3,213,809.43	65,161,067.28
1896	53,910,937.02	1,670,005.53	6,572,390.14	3,227,409.06	3,588,622.06	68,769,883.81
1897	60,618,239.77	1,015,314.39	9,371,521.03	13,188,013.86	2,810,248.66	87,003,337.71
1898	69,881,120.57	1,187,682.99	26,477,370.06	47,210,077.84	2,936,943.37	147,693,194.83
1899	76,252,487.23	1,158,307.57	30,336,559.47	32,785,152.48	2,964,683.90	143,497,190.65
1900	87,458,836.23	1,389,066.68	22,720,150.22	18,834,495.33	3,517,540.93	133,920,119.59
1901	92,829,685.86	1,116,179.86	27,189,659.12	27,906,489.13	3,959,656.64	153,101,680.61
Total	1,237,330,049.99	54,079,269.29	327,354,413.15	384,372,020.25	67,205,029.86	2,070,330,782.54

Abundance of currency makes good times and a scarcity of money makes hard times, and every contention that we have made heretofore or are now making for the quantitative the one of money is now admitted, not only by the Secretary of the Treasury, but by all the conditions. Our friends always misunderstood us, and I suppose they did it because they did not get at our real meaning. None of us ever insisted that silver was sacred or that gold was sacred. What we contended was that we did not have enough national money owned and controlled by the Government of the United States itself, and therefore when we coined all the gold and all the silver that could be gotten at our mints that we would still be short. That was our contention.

At the time there was a great scarcity of money. Following that came the greatest gold production that the earth has ever known. As that gold increased in volume business increased, and the year just passed we put more gold into the Treasury than ever went in before since this Government has been in existence. We have to-day \$2.72 per capita more money in circulation than we had even two years ago. We have the largest circulation now that we have ever had since we have been a people. Therefore we have had the best times that we have ever had during the history of the Government.

Mr. HILL. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. BELL. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Do you think that the effect on the prosperity of this country is due solely to the increase of money in this country or to the general increase of money in the world?

Mr. BELL. It has had a greater influence on the general prosperity in this country, and this was supplemented by the fact that we have had such phenomenal crops and such a phenomenal

production of things that foreigners wanted during this special time.

Mr. HILL. Then you think that the prosperity is due to the phenomenal crops rather than to the increase in the circulating medium?

Mr. BELL. The phenomenal crops brought a great deal of this money to our shores.

Mr. HILL. If the increase in money during the last five years in this country has brought such a phenomenal prosperity to the United States, why has not the increase in Germany brought about a like prosperity to Germany?

Mr. BELL. The conditions are entirely different in Germany from a money and from an industrial standpoint.

Mr. HILL. That is what I think.

Mr. BELL. Germany has not had any such increase of money.

Mr. HILL. Oh, yes.

Mr. BELL. No; she has not. Germany has not had mines pouring out money in every conceivable portion of the country. Germany has not had the great productions that we have had in the diversified crops or the exports in other lines; not by any means.

Mr. HILL. After all, is it not the phenomenal crops that we have had that has given us the increase of prosperity, rather than the increase in the circulating medium?

Mr. BELL. The phenomenal crops that we have had have brought us great sums of money, and it has been the money condition and our industrial advantages combined. No one thing ever accounts for a prosperity like ours. I say the war in South Africa has done a great deal for our farmers in this country and for our producers, and all these war conditions—our own war in

the Philippines has done a great deal. But there is no doubt that our great money supply has done much.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman please explain to me, when the per capita circulation in the United States is \$28, and in Austria \$7, and in Belgium \$21, and the British Empire and in Australasia, \$25, and varying from \$2, and \$3, and \$4 in the different countries, where they are immediately adjoining each other in Europe, where the means of getting from one country to the other is so easy, how is it that this prosperity is not going from one to the other under your theory of circulation?

Mr. BELL. Per capita circulation has never been regarded by any economist as any test whatever. The original test, I think was by Calhoun, when the great discussion took place here, and all hands agreed that the per capita circulation did not signify anything except as a test of the quantity of the money of the country, and that you must have your money based upon worth of property to be exchanged. The equilibrium between money and property to be exchanged. A poor, nonprogressive people can absorb but little money.

Mr. HILL. I hope the gentleman will follow that line of argument right up in the next two or three weeks, when we bring in the bill for a set currency, which provides distinctly that there should be a volume of currency in the country to meet the demands of the business required to be done.

Mr. BELL. I would agree with your theory of exchange if you did not put the money in the hands of the banker, but let the Government issue it and control it, so that the bankers could not have the people buy of them and make the bankers prosperous, and leave the people to their misery, at the pleasure of the national-bank associations.

Mr. HILL. I will make a square proposition to the gentleman now: If he will show me any possible way by which the Government can issue any money having any relation to the business of the country I will vote for his proposition.

Mr. BELL. I have just given you Calhoun's views in the matter. There was a means suggested in his day, that the Government could very easily make the equilibrium of, say, \$1 in money to each \$30 in property to be exchanged.

Mr. HILL. How are they going to get it in circulation?

Mr. BELL. There is no trouble about getting money into circulation. This Government pays out millions daily, sells bonds from time to time, and buys money. Money will get in circulation—do not be uneasy—while we run this expensive machine.

Mr. HILL. Except in the payment of debt, how can the Government get money in circulation?

Mr. BELL. There need be no trouble about that. The Government has debts enough to put money in circulation for many years to come, and will always be making them.

Mr. HILL. But the Government of the United States, nor no other government in the world, has any power to put a dollar of money into circulation except by the payment of debts already incurred.

Mr. BELL. I notice that there was no difficulty about getting the greenbacks into circulation and none whatever in getting the Treasury notes into circulation. The banks of this country are trying to destroy every dollar that the Government has now in circulation and are trying to replace it with their own currency, and they may eventually force this Government to pay its debts.

Mr. HILL. With the gentleman's permission, I will ask him to tell me of some way that the United States Government can put one dollar into circulation except paying it on a debt which is already incurred.

Mr. BELL. Why, there is no question but what there are millions of debts annually incurred, and are enough now outstanding to absorb a billion dollars' worth of currency.

Mr. HILL. I am talking about debts already incurred.

Mr. BELL. The Government is making debts all the time. There is no trouble about getting money into circulation with an enterprising Government, but you want to take the money out of circulation.

Mr. COCHRAN. Let me ask the gentleman from Connecticut: Does the Government put money into circulation when it issues, for instance, a large amount of interest-bearing bonds, when they can be exchanged for currency and the currency can be exchanged for bonds? Was it not able to put money into circulation that way?

Mr. HILL. It may if they were to go on issuing bonds.

Mr. COCHRAN. They have done it once; can not they do it now.

Mr. BELL. The coinage of this country is the greatest that this country has ever seen; we have more money than we have ever had before; and I find now, if the newspapers are to be believed, that the same power which is trying to destroy every dollar of Government paper and silver money is going to make its assault on gold. That question was raised twenty years ago. That was the contention in Europe twenty years ago—that they should destroy both gold and silver and have only bank paper.

I say that, in my judgment, the most dangerous thing that ever has come into this House is this banking bill that is before this Chamber at this time. You have here a Secretary of the Treasury, one of the greatest bankers of the land, insisting that the Government stop guaranteeing even the payment of the bank currency. You find him insisting that the banks may issue to the extent of their capital stock, put it upon the market, and it shall be made full legal tender as between citizens.

Mr. HILL. There is no such proposition.

Mr. BELL. It is in the bill itself.

Mr. HILL. There is no such proposition in the bill.

Mr. BELL. I am afraid the gentleman has not read the bill.

Mr. HILL. The gentlemen from Colorado can not have read the bill understandingly and maintain such a proposition.

Mr. BELL. Let us see whether I am right or not. It is idle for our friend or anybody else to insist that this is a dernier ressort.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman show me the proposition where the banking currency is made in this country legal tender between citizens?

Mr. BELL. I make the direct statement that it is provided that these notes they issue for the purpose of redeeming these outstanding obligations shall be a legal tender for all debts, public and private, except the interest on the public debt and import duties.

Mr. HILL. That is not a note issued by the bank at all. That is a United States greenback, and no change is made in the provision of the law. The gentleman himself has not read the bill.

Mr. BELL. Yes, I have read it; and I say there is not a provision in it that is for the people. It is essentially a bankers' bill from beginning to end, and the provisions all show that. Now, here is the provision:

The manner and form of the assumption of the current redemption of the United States notes, as aforesaid, shall be as follows: Each note shall bear the indorsement:

"For value received, the ——— national bank of [city], [State], will currently redeem this note in gold coin until the same has been paid and canceled in accordance with the provisions of law."

Mr. HILL. Is that a bank note?

Mr. BELL. It is.

Mr. HILL. Not at all; it is a United States greenback. If the gentleman will pardon me, I think he has read the bill cursorily. The note to which he refers is the United States note, precisely the same as it is now, in no form or manner changed.

Mr. BELL. You assume these obligations, and you are going to force the people to take them with your indorsement upon them and they become your notes.

Mr. HILL. It is the same greenback that it is now.

Mr. BELL. You agree to assume 130,000,000 of this as your paper, and instead of issuing new obligations you indorse the greenback and send it out, and from that time it becomes your obligation, and it is just the same as though you issued new obligations.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman pardon me? The United States Treasury carries its reserve fund precisely the same as it does now, and the final payment is by the United States the same as it is now. In no way, shape, or manner is it changed in character, quality, or obligation. The only feature of it is that the burden is thrown upon the banks to redeem the obligations instead of compelling the United States Government to do it, but the final obligation is canceled by the Government and the legal obligation rests precisely where it does now without change. As I said before, either the gentleman has not read the bill or else he has read it so hastily that he does not comprehend its purpose.

Mr. BELL. The bill provides that you shall get these obligations on condition that you assume them, what will amount to one hundred and thirty millions of these outstanding obligations. Now, you assume and take from the Government one hundred and thirty millions, and instead of your issuing new obligations you simply provide that you shall assume these old greenbacks and put your indorsement on them, and from that time on you provide that they shall be yours. Why did you put the indorsement on?

Mr. HILL. The taxes go into the Treasury of the United States and then they come out again in payment of these obligations.

That does not change the proposition at all. You are talking about an entirely different subject. What I say is that these greenbacks are now obligations of the Government.

Mr. HILL. They continue so.

Mr. BELL. These greenbacks are now to be redeemed by the Government.

Mr. HILL. Certainly; you are right.

Mr. BELL. They are now legal tender for all debts, public and private, except customs dues and interest on the public debt.

Mr. HILL. And they continue just that way.

Mr. BELL. Yes; this bill provides that you shall assume this obligation, and from that time it shall be your obligation.

Mr. HILL. Not at all.

Mr. BELL. The writer of this bill did not understand that

they would continue to be a legal tender as before, for in the next section it provides that you assume them by your indorsement and they become your obligation as a legal tender. I do not know why you did not leave out that section. Now, let us see how this is:

The manner and form of the assumption of the redemption of the United States note, as aforesaid, shall be as follows: The assumption for value received, the national banks, city or State, will currently redeem until the same has been paid and canceled in accordance with the provisions of law. Any note so indorsed shall be a legal tender "except for import duties and interest on the public debt."

Mr. HILL. The bill does not change the obligation at all.

Mr. BELL. Then why did you put that in?

Mr. HILL. Because there was no change made in the character of the obligation whatever.

Mr. BELL. Why did you make it again a legal tender?

Mr. HILL. We do not. We leave it just as it is.

Mr. BELL. You say it shall be a legal tender.

Mr. HILL. It is now.

Mr. BELL. Why did you put that section in? It stands for nothing if your position is right. My position is that you say to the Government, "You do these things for us, and we will take this burden off of you. Instead of issuing your own paper, we will put this obligation in a certain form." Then you provide that that shall be a legal tender.

A MEMBER. Do you suggest leaving out that clause?

Mr. BELL. No. But I say they made it a legal tender. And I want to say here and now that if the banks of this country are to issue and control the currency, it ought to be absolute legal tender. There ought not to be any of this partial legal-tender money. If the banks are to issue money for this Government, it ought to be full legal tender; it ought to pay all debts, both public and private. I do not know why the bondholders should not take this obligation the same as anybody else. There may be some reason why the import duties might be required to be paid in something else; but I do not see why a man who holds a Government bond should be a favored creditor of this nation except as regards bonds already outstanding.

We have given hundreds of millions already to these bondholders. They are pets of this Government. Since I have been a member of this House I have seen a message come here from the President of the United States saying to you and to me that if we would put into one sale of these bonds a provision that they should be paid in gold he could save over \$16,000,000 in the issuing of such bonds. I saw that and you saw it. The Republicans on this floor and the Democrats, too, stood up and said, "We can not afford to make our bonds all payable in gold, and if we make one class payable in gold absolutely the obligation will be extended to all the others."

Mr. Cleveland insisted that the insertion of such a clause would make a difference in the value of these bonds payable in gold as compared with those simply payable in coin—a difference of a little more than \$16,000,000. We said we would pay the \$16,000,000. Immediately the bondholder purchased them as silver bonds at a reduced price of \$16,000,000, and now the Treasury Department is treating those bonds as gold obligations. This is a gift of \$16,000,000, and if it was some one that was having a little transaction with the Government, why they would chase him by the month for a little wash bill. Those fellows walk off with over \$16,000,000 of the Government money.

Now, I am not prejudiced against banks and bankers, but I want to say they have got this Government by the throat, and they are trying to get a new hold on it, and the great banks of this country are getting now Government money worth nearly \$8,000 a day for nothing. No ordinary citizen can get it. If this bill is passed I want to say good-bye to American industrial independence. Anybody that wants good investments must get in a big bank; he must not get in a little one, because the little banks will be crushed and go out of existence as these mighty institutions spread.

I have detained you longer than I expected or should have done, and I want to say in regard to these three bills, when these gentlemen bring them up for hearing, I will not get a chance to discuss them, you will not get a chance to discuss them; they will be whipped through here without discussion and without amendment, and while I often hear it said that there is never a time when the House can not overrule the Speaker, I say that that may be technically so, but it is not really so.

Mr. HILL. You do not object, do you, to the Government putting upon the banks the burden of paying one hundred and thirty millions of greenbacks, do you, and so relieving the Government from so much indebtedness?

Mr. BELL. I do, at the price the banks demand.

Mr. HILL. I do not know what that price is.

Mr. BELL. The price is that you shall turn over the destiny of this great country to the banks of the country.

Mr. HILL. That is a feature of the bill that I have not seen yet.

Mr. BELL. Well, I think you will find the opinion of the people. I want to be a banker if this bill ever passes.

Mr. HILL. There is not any earthly reason, if you have the capital to put up, why you should not be a banker now.

Mr. BELL. But I would not get in a little bank, because your object is to destroy the little banks. It will be the gigantic institutions that will spread their tentacles into every village in this country and wipe out the little banks or make them mere servants of the great central institutions, and these other banks will not have the assets upon which to issue the capital. The great institutions will be the ones to issue the capital and hire it out to the little banks. God forbid that such a nefarious act may be fastened upon this people.

Mr. SPIGHT. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to address myself to the pending bill, but to submit some remarks in connection with the resolution which it is understood is soon to be reported by the Committee on Rules providing for the appointment of a committee, nominally to investigate and report upon the question of the abridgment of the right of suffrage under the constitution and laws of any State in the Union, but really to be confined in its operations to certain Southern States in which the intelligent, virtuous, and property-holding classes have sought by peaceable and lawful methods to minimize the danger resulting from conferring political power upon ignorance, vice, and worthlessness.

I take advantage of this opportunity in general debate to submit some remarks on this resolution, because it is understood that when it is reported to the House the time for debate will be limited perhaps to twenty minutes on a side, which would amount practically to no time at all.

The purpose of this resolution is ostensibly to reduce the representation of these proscribed States on the floor of this House and in the electoral college on the specious pretense of love for and obedience to the Constitution of the United States. And yet the political party which is pushing this scheme is the party which has so often in recent years, and during the present session of Congress, shown its utter disregard for the Constitution, and has ruthlessly trampled under foot some of the most sacred provisions of that instrument, which underlie the very foundations of our free institutions. Therefore I fear that it is not love and reverence for the Constitution which prompts this movement, but an unholy desire to win political advantage. [Applause on Democratic side.]

I am glad that many of the more conservative and thoughtful members of the Republican party have deprecated this effort to stir up the fast-dying embers of sectional strife and ill-will. I am glad that the spirit of the lamented McKinley still lives in the breasts of some of the men in the party of which he was so conspicuous a leader. From that great, loving, kindly, Christian heart of his there went out a note which was akin to the song of the heavenly choir announcing to the wondering shepherds in the hills of Judea the greatest event of all the ages, "Unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord." * * *. On earth peace, good will toward men." McKinley said, "Let the South alone," and not only held out an olive branch, but he had nothing but kind words for our people. I shall always be glad that in his long ride across the continent in the year of his death he passed through our country and gave to our people an opportunity to show their appreciation of his noble efforts to eradicate sectional bitterness, allay sectional strife, and bring about a complete reconciliation between all the people of this glorious country, reunited not in name alone but in spirit also.

Much as we differed from him on some great questions of governmental policy, we believed *then* and we know *now* that during his four years at the head of the National Administration McKinley did more to accomplish these beneficent purposes than any man who has lived since the close of the great war. [Applause.] Then it is not strange that his tragic death came to us as a personal bereavement. He was our friend and he had the manliness to tell us so, notwithstanding we had never voted for him, and he had the tact to do it in a manner not to offend, and to convince us of his sincerity. Nowhere in all this broad land of ours were found more sincere mourners than in the South when the news flashed over the wires and was telegraphed from heart to heart that his gentle spirit had taken its flight from earth forever. I wish that more of his love of fairness and grandeur of purpose might find lodgment in the breasts of the leaders of the Republican party of to-day.

I am glad we have reached a point in our history when we hear less of "rebels and Yankees" and more of America and Americans, and I hope soon to see the glad day when the Northern leaders of public sentiment are enabled to understand that Southern men of equally high character with themselves know more of the vexing problems which endanger the social and business interests of their section, and know better how to deal with them

than their brethren of other parts of the country who have not had the same opportunities for reaching correct conclusions with reference to these peculiar matters. There is no "negro problem" in the South if we can only be let alone in the management of our domestic affairs. The negro is happier, more content, and more generally prosperous than he has ever been since, by the proclamation by President Lincoln, he was declared to be a free man. That the conferring upon him of the elective franchise in his then condition was a great mistake has been long since conceded by many of the greatest and most patriotic thinkers of the Republican party.

But let us look further into the ultimate purposes of the advocates of this proscriptive legislation. I have no fears that the party in power will at this session of Congress reduce the representation of any State. In Congressional districts and in States where the negroes hold the balance of power the Republican candidates in the elections next fall may hope to win victories for themselves by singing a siren song of love to their black allies, but where there are few negroes and their votes unimportant the Republican candidates will not want to be handicapped by the accomplished fact of having reduced, for purely partisan reasons, the representation of any State and with the ghost of a force bill looming up on the horizon of the near future. This is especially true in such States as Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee.

If it were not that there still is truth in the heathen adage, "whom the gods would destroy they first make mad," I would not believe that this contemplated legislation would ever be enacted, and it may yet be that cooler and more conservative counsels will prevail, and there will be nothing but the miserable farce of a pretended investigation without any results except injury to the material interests of a people who are striving grandly to rebuild their waste places, advance along the lines of industrial and commercial progress, and preserve their magnificent civilization. But if the advocates of this repression should triumph over conservatism and should conclude that the people will endure it, their next step will be something in the nature of a force bill, with United States marshals around the polling places at Federal elections, and then that which is said to have broken loose in Georgia will be to pay.

In discussing this proposition to reduce representation in certain Southern States I shall undertake to do so under four subdivisions:

- First. The impracticability of the scheme.
- Second. The want of constitutional power on the part of Congress to deal with the question.
- Third. The effect of such action upon the business interests of the whole country, and
- Fourth. The effect upon the States subjected to such punitive legislation.

Under the first head I wish to call attention to the fact that there is no sufficient data upon which to base the contemplated action. Before there can be any intelligent and honest effort to reduce representation because of the denial or abridgment of the right of suffrage in any State there must be not only an ascertainment of the number of males over 21 years of age who are disfranchised, but the causes of such disfranchisement must also be shown.

Denial of the right to vote, which might result in reduction of representation under the provisions of section 2 of Article XIV of the Federal Constitution, can not be applied where the denial is a part of the punishment inflicted for the commission of crime. Every State is the sole judge as to what should constitute crime within its own jurisdiction, with the single limitation that such State laws shall not conflict with any provision of the Constitution of the United States. In Mississippi there are thousands who are denied the right to vote on account of the commission of crime, independent of other disqualifying causes, and yet there is no information available to Congress or reasonably to an investigating committee as to the number thus disfranchised.

A committee could ascertain the number now in the State penitentiary, and by examining the records of all the courts in every county could find the number in the jails and undergoing punishment in the hands of contractors for convict labor. This would be a long and expensive undertaking, and yet it would not furnish half the necessary information. There are thousands of others who have suffered their penalties, been discharged from custody, and are scattered all over the country, and who are still and forever disqualified from voting.

Again, it will be practically impossible to ascertain how many who have not registered as voters are disqualified for any reason and how many are not. Some whites and many negroes who could qualify fail to do so because of want of interest in political affairs.

Not half the white men in Mississippi whose names appear on the registration books vote in general elections, because, under

our system of nomination by primary election, when a Democratic candidate is indorsed by his party the contest is ended, and only a fractional part of the Democratic and practically none of the Republican vote is polled at the general election. The advocates of this punitive legislation realize the insurmountable difficulties in the way of obtaining information necessary for intelligent action and propose to take as a basis of their calculations the vote actually polled in Congressional elections. One of the zealous supporters of this scheme, in a communication to the Washington Post a few days ago, takes the Congressional Directory as his guide, and compares the vote of Mississippi, by districts, with the vote of New York. Either ignorantly or corruptly he ignores the fact that in Mississippi there was no contest, and not one-third of the registered vote was polled, while in New York there was a hot fight, and practically all the votes on both sides were brought out.

No man on this floor who has any regard for truth and fairness will say that because all the qualified electors do not exercise their right to vote the State shall be punished by reducing its representation to that extent. There is no power under any constitution or statute that can compel a man to vote. The privilege is conferred under certain conditions, but its exercise is a purely voluntary act and can not be made compulsory. To reduce a State's representation because some of her citizens who are eligible as electors do not see proper to register and vote would be a monstrous and inexcusable crime against the sovereignty of the State and a flagrant and willful violation of the very clause of the Constitution which the friends of this measure profess to be so anxious to uphold. As I said in a speech delivered in the Fifty-sixth Congress on this subject, there must be another census, with specially prepared questions, before any such information can be obtained that would justify Congress to undertake the enforcement of this resolution.

Mr. PALMER. Suppose the facts can be ascertained, are you willing then to have your representation reduced?

Mr. SPIGHT. We are not willing, I will say in answer to that question, to surrender the rights the surrender of which has not been demanded from other States. I will say to the gentleman before I get through that as a last resort we would not only concede the right to reduce our representation, or the power to reduce our representation, but we would rather give it all up, and without any representation at all in this House, than to return again to the state of affairs existing in the reconstruction period, from 1869 to 1876.

Under my second subdivision I deny that Congress has the Constitutional power to deal with this question as now presented, but it is one for the Supreme Court first to determine. If any State, by its constitutional or statutory enactments, has violated any section or clause of the Federal Constitution this is not the forum in which that violation shall be declared; but it is a question which must be heard, tried, and determined in the judicial tribunal constituted for that purpose; and whenever that great court shall declare that the organic or statute law of a State is in conflict with any provision of the Constitution of the United States, then such State must modify its own enactments to conform to the decision of the court or suffer the penalties imposed.

The first section of the fourteenth amendment declares that "all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside;" but mere citizenship does not confer the right to vote. One must be a citizen before the privilege of the elective franchise can be bestowed, but this is not enough. Every woman and child born or naturalized in the United States is a citizen, but not a voter. The United States can make citizens but it can not make qualified voters. This latter power belongs only to the States, without any Federal limitations except that prescribed in the fifteenth amendment that "the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." Subject to this restriction alone, the States have complete jurisdiction of the whole question of suffrage.

In the case of the *United States v. Cruikshanks* (92 U. S., 542), the Supreme Court says:

The Constitution has not conferred the right of suffrage upon anyone, and the United States have no voters of their own creation in the States. The fifteenth amendment has invested the citizens of the United States with a new constitutional right, which is exemption from discrimination in the exercise of the elective franchise on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The right of suffrage is not a necessary attribute of national citizenship. The right to vote in the States comes from the States, but the right of exemption from the prohibited discrimination comes from the United States. The first has not been granted or secured by the Constitution of the United States; but the last has been.

In *Barbier v. Connolly* (113 U. S., 237), in speaking of the fourteenth amendment, it is said:

Class legislation, discrimination against some and favoring others, is prohibited; but legislation which, in carrying out a public purpose, if within

the sphere of its operation it affects alike all persons similarly situated, is not within the amendment.

In *McPherson v. Blacker* (146 U. S., 1) it is declared that—

Neither the Constitution nor the fourteenth amendment made all citizens voters.

In *Williams v. Mississippi* (170 U. S., 213), which was an appeal from a decision of the supreme court of Mississippi holding that the constitution of 1890 was not in conflict with any clause of the Federal Constitution, one of the assignments of error was that the State constitution denied or abridged the right to vote, and that the representation in Congress had not been reduced in consequence thereof, thus presenting the very question sought to be raised by this resolution, and the Supreme Court of the United States, in a unanimous opinion, said: "The constitution and statutes of Mississippi do not on their face discriminate between the races," and the decision of the Mississippi court was affirmed. Thus it is shown that the constitution of Mississippi has been tested and sustained in the supreme courts of both the State and the United States. I will read the two sections of the present constitution of Mississippi upon which assaults have been made and which were considered by the court in the *Williams* case, from which I have just quoted:

SEC. 241. Every male inhabitant of this State except idiots, etc., * * * 21 years old and upwards, who has resided in this State two years, and one year in the election district * * * and who is duly registered * * * and who has not been convicted of bribery, burglary, theft, arson, obtaining money by false pretenses, perjury, forgery, embezzlement, or bigamy, and who has paid, on or before the 1st day of February in the year in which he shall offer to vote, all taxes which may have been required of him * * * is declared to be a qualified elector.

Section 244 contains the "understanding clause" about which so much has been heard, and reads as follows:

On and after the 1st day of January, 1892, every elector shall, in addition to the foregoing qualifications, be able to read any section of the constitution of this State, or he shall be able to understand the same when read to him, or give a reasonable interpretation thereof.

These sections do not deny the right of suffrage to anyone, but merely prescribe qualifications, which when summed up stand for good citizenship and some degree of intelligence. They shut out the ignorant, the vicious, the criminals, and those who, from worthlessness or disinclination, contribute nothing toward the support of the Government which protects them in their persons and property and furnishes the money to educate their children. For this the State is threatened with punishment by reducing our representation in Congress.

Mr. PALMER. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. SPIGHT. Certainly.

Mr. PALMER. If you have in fact excluded any portion of your population from exercising the right of suffrage, do you think they ought to be represented?

Mr. SPIGHT. The policy of the Government has been to base representation on population, and all ought to be represented. The Government is for the protection of all the people and for their benefit and not merely for those who vote, and I believe it is right that the representation should be based upon population rather than upon the number of those who should see proper to exercise the elective franchise.

Mr. PALMER. Then you ought to repeal the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. SPIGHT. Well, sir, the party to which I belong is not responsible for the grafting of that amendment upon the Constitution; and whenever your party see proper to propose to repeal it, then we would be willing to vote with you on that.

Mr. PALMER. Is not the fourteenth amendment just as much a part of the Constitution as any other section? And ought it not to be enforced as much as any other section, as long as it is a part of the Constitution?

Mr. SPIGHT. Yes. And we are not violating it either, and do not intend to; and if we do, whenever it is shown to us by competent authority that we have violated it we are willing to bow to the decision of the court.

Mr. PALMER. As I understand it, that is exactly the purpose of this committee—to find out whether you have violated it or whether you are violating it—and you gentlemen object to a fair investigation.

Mr. SPIGHT. The Supreme Court of the United States has said that the Mississippi constitution is not in conflict with any clause of the Federal Constitution, and whenever they say that we are violating the Constitution of the United States we will bow to that decision, but we do not in advance propose to concede that we are doing that thing.

A number of Northern States have provisions very much like these and have had for years, but no effort has been made to reduce their representation.

While the Supreme Court of the United States has never directly decided the question, it is held by many of the ablest lawyers and most profound thinkers of this country that the adoption of the fifteenth amendment had the effect of abrogating the puni-

tive clause of the second section of the fourteenth amendment, and among this number was James G. Blaine, one of the most brilliant men of his generation, a great leader of the Republican party, and with an intense anti-Southern feeling.

In his book, *Twenty Years in Congress*, speaking of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments and the effect of the one upon the other, he uses this language:

When the nation, by subsequent change in its Constitution, declared that the State shall not exclude the negro from the right of suffrage, it neutralized and surrendered the contingent right as heretofore held to exclude him from the basis of apportionment. Congress is thus plainly deprived by the fifteenth amendment of certain powers over representation in the South which it previously possessed under the fourteenth amendment. Before the adoption of the fifteenth amendment if a State should exclude the negro from suffrage, the next step would be for Congress to exclude the negro from the basis of apportionment. After the adoption of the fifteenth amendment if a State should exclude the negro from suffrage, the next step would be for the Supreme Court to declare that the act was unconstitutional and therefore null and void.

But Mr. Blaine expressed the opinion that the first, third, and fourth sections of the fourteenth amendment were not affected by the adoption of the fifteenth amendment. So that, in the estimation of this eminent authority, this question is not one for a partisan Congress to determine, but is one for the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. In further answer to the gentleman's question I wish to suggest that as eminent an authority as Judge Cooley has said, in his *Principles of Constitutional Law*, that an educational qualification is not an abridgment of the suffrage; that a tax qualification is not an abridgment of the suffrage; that a thing in order to be an abridgment of the suffrage must cut it entirely off, but that a qualification such that a man may equip himself for suffrage is not an abridgment, and he refers to several Supreme Court decisions in support of that proposition.

Mr. SPIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to refer to that authority also, but I shall adopt the language of my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] and will leave that branch of the subject.

Whatever may be said as to the validity of what is known as "the grandfather clause" in some of the recently adopted State constitutions, the discussion of which I shall leave to gentlemen whose States are affected thereby, the constitution of Mississippi has stood the test, and there is no longer any question as to its validity. The third proposition which I propose to discuss briefly is the effect of the agitation of this question upon the business interests of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say that the time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SPIGHT] has expired.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have leave to conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi be allowed to conclude his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPIGHT. I am much obliged to the gentleman for his kindness.

With the freedom from political disturbances which has prevailed for several years, the South is advancing more rapidly along industrial lines than any other part of this country. Labor is becoming more settled. The negro, instead of looking to politics as his chief end, is devoting himself to raising corn and cotton and providing the necessities of life for his family, and striving for a home of his own. The enormous value of our agricultural products, our coal and iron fields, our gushing oil wells, our forests of valuable timber, and our rapidly growing manufacturing interests of various kinds, together with our salubrious and semitropical climate, and with fuel and water for the motive power of machinery in sight of the raw products for feeding the factories, have attracted Northern and Eastern capitalists, and they have invested millions of dollars in Southern enterprises; and under wise and beneficent policies there is no limit to the possibilities of the South in progress and development. It would be superfluous for me to say that the greater the prosperity of the South the more abundant the wealth of the whole country.

It is also a self-evident fact that when disturbing causes contribute to retarding the growth and development of the South the great centers of trade are injuriously affected. It is of almost, if not quite, as much moment to the business interests of the North and East as to the South to avoid every disturbing element which would tend toward checking our development and the unsettling of property values. Everything which has a tendency to stir up strife, alienate labor, and create distrust in the minds of capitalists is a menace to the business interests of the country which every patriotic citizen desires to prevent. Gentlemen who favor this repressive legislation for partisan purposes and political advantage will find, when it may be too late, that the sober business sense in every section of the country will condemn it as unwise, unpatriotic, and hurtful.

The last proposition to which I shall address myself is the effect which the contemplated action would have upon the States to which it is intended to apply. Nobody on either side of this question believes that it is the purpose to interfere with any but Southern States, and in considering this last branch of the subject I shall speak of it as it will affect Mississippi, and I believe that the same conditions will be found to exist in a large measure in all the other proscribed States.

While the language of our constitution is so carefully guarded as to prevent its conflict with the fifteenth amendment, I will not deny that the leading purpose was to eliminate the negro from the political equation, and no honest man who has any conception of the horrors of the reconstruction period can blame us. None but those who suffered as we did can understand what we had to endure in the fateful years from 1869 to 1876. Our homes were desolated, our fields were only waste places, our property was gone, and our magnificent civilization was threatened. The hungry carpetbagger, without conscience or decency, the synonym of rapine and plunder, had invaded our land and desecrated the high stations once occupied by our fathers. Attila, the Hun, was called the "scourge of God;" the carpetbagger was, in fact, the scourge of the devil.

A black horde, whose dense ignorance was only equalled by their credulity, were the willing tools of their unscrupulous leaders and rejoiced in the power to oppress and humiliate the white people of the State. Imagine, if you can, what the intelligent and virtuous people of any Northern State would feel if they should be compelled to look into the office of their chief executive and see a man posing as governor, an alien and a stranger, without a dollar's worth of property in the State, and without a spark of sympathy for the people over whom he was called to rule. Then turn to the legislative halls and find them filled with the most ignorant and depraved class in the Commonwealth, reveling in a saturnalia of plunder, and assuming to make laws of which they have no conception save that they are intended to put "black heels on white necks," and then tell me, if you dare, that the people would stand it.

All this and more we have seen, and the only wonder is that we bore it so long. At last when "forbearance had ceased to be a virtue" delivery from these hateful and ruinous conditions could only be accomplished in one of two ways. Either there must be open violence and bloodshed, or the more peaceful method of the tissue ballot must be resorted to. Driven to desperation as were our people, I do not deny that, for a time, election frauds were practiced, and the only apology, if any I should make, which I have to offer is, that it was that or worse, and I am not ashamed to say that under the same conditions we would do it again. But for many years elections in Mississippi have been as free from fraud as in any State in this Union.

Notwithstanding two disastrous crop seasons in succession our people are forging ahead, and though our farmers are much depressed by their failures in the last two years, with the courage which has always characterized Mississippians they enter upon this new year with renewed hope and confidence. As I have said before, the negro is more contented than he has ever been since his emancipation, and his pretended white friends can do him no greater harm than to hold out to him again the tempting bauble of political activity. It will demoralize him as laborer, wage-earner, and wealth producer and will strike a deadly blow at all prosperity. No better advice can be given than to say "let the negro alone." The white people are paying for the education of his children, and he knows it. He is on terms of friendship with the dominant classes and his rights are as well protected as in any State in the Union, and all he has to do is to be a law-abiding and industrious citizen and he will command the respect and good will of the white people, who are his best friends. Nothing but harm can come from filling his mind again with political ideas. He is emotional in the highest degree and is easily carried away by blind, unreasoning enthusiasm, and it would be an easy task for a shrewd, designing, and unscrupulous white man to make him believe that he is an important political factor and so poison his mind as to unfit him for the ordinary and profitable duties of life.

If it is imagined by the advocates of this resolution that the threat which it conveys, or the actual reduction of our representation, will compel our people to change our suffrage laws, they are laboring under a gross delusion. It will never be done. We would rather have no representation in Congress than to have ignorance, vice, and corruption restored to political power in our State government.

We still have in the South the truest and noblest type of Anglo-Saxon civilization to be found in the world, and we intend to preserve it at all hazards. We received it in a halo of glory from our fathers, and we intend to transmit it untarnished to our children. We love honor and true manhood. We admire courage and patriotic devotion to duty wherever found. We despise

hypocrisy and condemn a coward. We love our State and all her interests and are proud of her achievements in field and forum.

The sanctity of our homes and the purity of our beauteous womanhood are far dearer to us than life itself, and these can be cherished, fostered, and protected only under a white man's government; and this we will maintain with "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." You may shear us of our political power, if you will, but we will still have left the proud consciousness of knowing that we are right; that our homes and our loved ones are protected, and our local governments remain in our own hands; and trusting to Him who rules nations and peoples, and waiting for the returning sense of justice, and believing that the American people will yet do right, we will "run with patience the race that is set before us," and in the light of our Christian civilization solve every problem as it arises. [Loud applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Just one word. Is the gentleman from Missouri in his seat?

Mr. BENTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. We have had one hour and you have had the balance of the day. How much additional time does my friend require?

Mr. BENTON. Well, so far as I know fifty minutes covers all the time I have promised; and if there is no other gentleman on that side to speak, why we can get through by 5 o'clock.

Mr. CANNON. Then I will ask unanimous consent that we close general debate when we adjourn to-day.

Mr. BENTON. I see no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that general debate upon this bill close with to-day's session. Is there objection?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I suggest if the gentleman can take care of me in the morning, if I have no time between now and 5 o'clock, I shall have no objection.

Mr. BENTON. You can protect yourself under the five-minute rule by obtaining an extension.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Chairman, I make the usual apology in submitting these remarks. I apologize because I shall not discuss the bill under consideration; but it would seem that an apology is hardly necessary, inasmuch as it appears to be the custom of this House to discuss the merits of one measure while some other measure is being considered. It is not deemed improper to discuss, for instance, the tariff when the Indian appropriation bill is under consideration. Bills about which there is an honest difference of opinion are rushed through almost without debate, while ample time for discussion is permitted when bills about which there is no contest are considered. Fortunately there is, I am told, no rule of the House requiring gentlemen to confine their remarks to the subject under consideration. This strikes the new member as being a little peculiar, but we are told that this is one of the great liberties permitted by the Reed rules.

Now, in the exercise of my right as an American Representative, I saw fit the other day to introduce certain resolutions requiring the Speaker to appoint a select committee of 13, whose duty it shall be to investigate the corrupt use of money in elections by all the great political parties. These resolutions have been misrepresented to such an extent by the Republican press of the country that I feel constrained to submit some remarks.

The reply of the Republican press is threefold. They say, first, that I am proposing to investigate the use of money by the Republican party only, and that the resolutions are therefore unfair. Those who charge this certainly did not read the resolutions.

The word "Republican" is not used. They would inaugurate an investigation of the use of money by the national committees of all the great political parties offering candidates for President in the years 1896 and 1900. Why the Republican press should distort the resolutions I can not imagine, unless it is prompted to do so by a consciousness of the guilt of its own party. Secondly, this partisan press has attempted a little ridicule which is indeed crushing. It suggests that I am a new member. My reply is that I came here just as soon as I could get here. [Laughter.] Thirdly, it suggests that I am a member of unimportant committees. I deny this; but if it be true, a Republican Speaker is responsible, and not myself. [Laughter.] All this, Mr. President, will not prevent honest men, thinking men, from giving the resolutions some consideration.

How is it that this House is about to enter into an investigation of the affairs of the States? What has provoked the resolutions of the gentleman from Indiana? I can only speak for my own State. It is not necessary to go further back than the year 1894. During that year two parties, professedly opposite in principles, united to carry our State. One favored the free coinage of silver, while the other was committed to the gold standard. One favored the subtreasury project, while the other favored the national banks.

One favored the Government ownership of railroads, while the other favored the railroad ownership of government. And there were other radical differences between these two parties, but all that made no difference. Offices they wanted and offices they intended to have. So they divided out all the offices, except the electors for President. Their leaders even went so far as to calculate the emoluments of the numerous offices parceled out in order that the division might be just and fair. This is not a jest, Mr. Chairman, but a melancholy truth. On election day, in compliance with their programme, 50,000 white men walked to the ballot box by the side of more than 100,000 negroes, and decent government was overthrown in the State.

It gives me pleasure to admit that some men in both these parties repudiated this unnatural alliance, and that most of those who did repudiate it helped us to redeem the State in 1898. What was the result? What offspring was born to this union? As I love my State, I hesitate to make this admission. As I am proud of her history, I am ashamed for the world to hear it. The result of this fusion enabled more than 900 incompetent negroes—some of them vicious, very many of them venal—to occupy positions of trust or profit in our good old State from 1894 to 1898.

There was incompetency almost everywhere. Public virtue was ridiculed. There were many rumors of scandal in high places. Bills were put upon the statute books which never passed either house of the general assembly. The negro, by nature kind, became insolent. Our wives and our daughters walked the streets of some of our largest towns in the broad day time in constant fear of negro insults. During these few moments I can give you but a faint idea of the humiliation of our good old State.

In 1898 the white men of North Carolina united and swept these people from power. In 1900 they boldly, openly adopted an amendment to their constitution which renders a repetition of this condition forever impossible. I have not the time to-day, Mr. Chairman, to discuss the constitutionality of that amendment. We believe it will be sustained by the courts. We do not believe that by law the Republican majority in the House has any right to reduce our representation here. But we have done what we have done.

If the law of the land requires a reduction in our representation in this House we will submit to it. I undertake to say there is not a Democratic member from our State who would not willingly give up his seat if it were necessary to save our State from the curse of negro rule. If you wish to punish us for protecting our homes, do your worst. We defy you. We shall appeal from the blind partisan here to our patriotic and sympathetic white brother in all the States of the Union. Think you this appeal will be in vain?

But, Mr. Chairman, while they are proposing to investigate, I thought it would be a good idea to propose an additional investigation. Let us ascertain, if we can, something about the corrupt use of money in our national elections. While you are investigating the legal suppression of the negro vote in the South, suppose you investigate the purchase of white votes in other sections. It is a matter of common knowledge that large funds are raised and distributed in every campaign by the Republican party. It is charged, and not denied, that this corruption fund (for it can have no other correct name) in 1896 amounted to millions. It has been charged that the Republican national chairman raised \$600,000 in one city, and more than a million in another. Of course this can not be proven without the aid of the law.

I do not undertake to say the statement is true, but it is believed to be true by many an honest man in this country. One of the editorials in a Republican paper, which misrepresented my resolutions (as the editor has since admitted), uses these words: "It is the common belief that far too much money is spent in our political campaigns. It is a growing evil, and many men deplore it." When a Republican paper makes this admission, Mr. Chairman, you may rest assured that a very grave evil exists. Whether true or false, there is a belief entertained by many a good man that the Presidency of this great Republic goes to the party who can raise the greatest corruption fund. Let us illustrate.

Suppose, in 1904, the Republican party shall name its candidate, supply its national chairman with unlimited means, as was said to be the case in 1896, and suppose the Democratic party shall name its candidate, and its national chairman shall only be supplied with enough money to defray the legitimate expenses of the campaign, which candidate do you suppose will win? Now, reverse the proposition. Give the Democratic national chairman plenty of money and the Republican chairman little or none. How do you think doubtful States will go?

Do you think, Mr. Chairman, that there would be very much Republican money put up on their candidate? The parties are so equally divided that a few doubtful States generally decide the election. How utterly abominable the practice of pouring money like water into these doubtful States to corrupt their votes! How utterly horrible this quadrennial contest between campaign

funds! If my party is guilty, let us turn on the lights. Let us investigate, and if these rumors be true which we constantly hear, let us do something to put an end to the practice forever.

We sometimes hear men suggest that the Republic is in danger. Most of this is idle talk. But, Mr. Chairman, there is one real danger; there is one ever-present menace to liberty. It overhangs our beloved country like a black cloud. It is the corruption of the American electorate by the use of money. Neither party can justify the practice by charging that the other party is guilty. It never has been right to "fight the devil with fire." Gentlemen can not evade the responsibility. No man should be willing for his party to do that which he would not do himself.

For one, Mr. Chairman, I prefer a repression of partisan strife. Rancor and partisan bitterness are to be deplored at all times. Let us look beyond our own State, our own section, and embrace within our loyalty and our love every inch of this Republic. Let the gentleman from Indiana be warned that no good can come of his investigation, but much harm. Let him be warned that it will open up strife in a land now prosperous and peaceful. It might be well for him to ask himself whether there is any demand for the passage of his resolutions. But if his party shall insist upon an investigation let it proceed to correct, if possible, the very greatest of all our national evils.

Mr. Chairman, it remains to be seen what will be done with the resolutions I have seen fit to introduce. They have been referred to the Committee on Rules. That committee is all-powerful, but the resolutions will not be reported. They will sleep, because, if adopted, they will expose such practices as will render a continuance of the power of the Republican party hereafter impossible. [Loud applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, on page 58 of this bill I find a provision which I intend to take as a text for a few remarks, which I will make as broad and philosophical as I can, concerning its general significance and concerning the general significance of conditions of the sort sought to be met by it throughout the world. This provision is for the enforcement of the Chinese-exclusion act.

Enforcement of the Chinese exclusion act: To prevent unlawful entry of Chinese into the United States, by the appointment of suitable officers to enforce the laws in relation thereto, and for expenses of returning to China all Chinese persons found to be unlawfully in the United States, including the cost of imprisonment and actual expense of conveyance of Chinese persons to the frontier or seaboard for deportation, \$200,000, of which sum \$1,000 per annum shall be paid to the collector of customs at Port Townsend as additional compensation and \$1,000 per annum shall be paid to the Commissioner-General of Immigration as additional compensation.

As an American citizen, as a Democrat, as a student of ethnology, I am emphatically in favor of that provision. I am emphatically in favor of every provision and every law which attempts at any hazard to secure to the Republic a homogeneity of population. I am in favor of every provision that would keep a white man's country his in its civilization, in its code of ethics, and in its government, and conversely of every law and policy that would restrain the white man in his own country and keep him from superimposing himself upon the black man, the yellow man, or the brown man in his country.

I will show you before I am through that in what I say I am expressing no narrow prejudice, no sectional view, but a conclusion at which white men have always arrived—men of our race—when they are confronted by a situation which demands any race conclusion at all.

Mr. Chairman, the feeling of the white race which leads it to try to guard itself from the infringement of other races, and which leads it to regard the amassing of any considerable number of any other race in its midst as a menace to its civilization and to its very life, is a feeling which has caused much argument concerning its source. Some people contend that it is an instinct; other people argue that it is a prejudice. I care not which it is; it is a fact, which has existed always under circumstances calling for its assertion, and which always will exist.

I do not myself think that it is an instinct, because I find little children not sharing it. I do not think it is a prejudice, because prejudice is a conclusion founded unreasonably and without cause. I would rather define it to be a common-sense, historical, induction and just conclusion, arrived at from being confronted with an actual condition. It has existed everywhere.

Early in the history of this country it existed in the anti-red man form in Massachusetts. All the early epistolary literature of New England is full of the idea, of white people, being the Israel of God, contending against red men, as Gentiles and Philistines, and Hittites and Amalekites. It exists in Arizona and New Mexico in the anti-Digger form. It exists on the Pacific slope in the anti-Chinese form. It exists in South Africa in the anti-Kaffir form. It exists down South, though not as strongly as elsewhere, in the anti-negro form.

It has gone down South only to the point of resenting any effort to bring the negroes to a social and political equality. It does not exist there industrially. It is everywhere else on the surface of

the globe a resentment against collaborating with the white man even. There have been some few exceptions upon limited areas in the Tropics, but wherever the exceptions have existed they have been followed by hybridizations, by loss of self-respect among men and women—the latter chiefly—by race deterioration, and by loss of manhood.

Now, gentlemen, I said that I would promise to show you that this feeling is not a feeling of mere prejudice, but is the common-sense conclusion of wise men when confronted with a situation. I want to read you a few lines from Abraham Lincoln, whom my people at one time hated perhaps as they hated no other man—a man whom the student of history learns to respect more and more from day to day as a man of broad charity and a very considerable degree of philosophy; marvelous, indeed, considering his preparation and education. Here is what he said in the general debate with Mr. Douglass in 1858:

Now, gentlemen, I do not want to read at any greater length, but this is the true complexion of all I have ever said in regard to the institution of slavery and the black race. This is the whole of it, and anything that argues me into his idea of perfect social and political equality with the negro is but a specious and fantastic arrangement of words, by which a man can prove a horse-chestnut to be a chestnut horse. I will say here, while upon this subject, that I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so. I have no purpose to introduce political and social equality between the white and black races. There is a physical difference between the two which, in my judgment, will probably forever forbid their living together upon the footing of perfect equality, and, inasmuch as it becomes a necessity that there must be a difference, I, as well as Judge Douglas, am in favor of the race to which I belong having the superior position. * * *

Judge Douglas has said to you that he has not been able to get from me an answer to the question whether I am in favor of negro citizenship. So far as I know, the judge never asked me such a question before. He shall have no occasion to ever ask it again, for I tell him very frankly that I am not in favor of negro citizenship. This furnishes me an occasion for saying a few words upon the subject. I mentioned, in a certain speech of mine which has been printed, that the Supreme Court had decided that a negro could not possibly be made a citizen, and, without saying what was my ground of complaint in regard to that or whether I had any grounds of complaint, Judge Douglas has from that thing manufactured nearly everything that he ever says about my disposition to produce an equality between the negroes and white people.

If anyone will read my speech he will find I mentioned that as one of the points decided in the course of the Supreme Court opinions, but I did not state what objection I had to it. But Judge Douglas tells the people what my objection was, when I did not tell them myself. Now, my opinion is that the different States have the power to make a negro a citizen under the Constitution of the United States, if they choose. The Dred Scott decision decides that they have not that power. If the State of Illinois had that power I should be opposed to the exercise of it. That is all I have to say about it.

Before proceeding let me say I think I have no prejudice against the Southern people. They are just what we would be in their situation. If slavery did not exist among them they would not introduce it. If it did now exist among us, we should not instantly give it up. This I believe of the masses North and South. Doubtless there are individuals on both sides who would not hold slaves under any circumstances and others who would gladly introduce slavery anew if it were out of existence. We know that some Southern men do free their slaves, go North, and become tip-top Abolitionists; while some Northern men go South and become most cruel slave masters. When Southern people tell us they are no more responsible for the origin of slavery than we, I acknowledge the fact.

When it is said that the institution exists, and that it is very difficult to get rid of it, in any satisfactory way, I can understand and appreciate the saying. I surely will not blame them for not doing what I should not know how to do myself. If all earthly power were given me, I should not know what to do as to the existing institution. My first impulse would be to free all the slaves and send them to Liberia, to their own native land. But a moment's reflection would convince me that whatever of high hope (as I think there is) there may be in this in the long run, its sudden execution is impossible. If they were all landed there in a day they would all perish in the next ten days; and there are not surplus shipping and surplus money enough in the world to carry them there in many times ten days. What then? Free them all and keep them among us as underlings?

Is it quite certain that this betters their condition? I think I would not hold one in slavery at any rate. Yet the point is not clear enough to me to denounce people upon. What next? Free them and make them politically and socially our equals? My own feelings will not admit of this; and if mine would, we well know that those of the great mass of white people will not. Whether this feeling accords with justice and sound judgment is not the sole question, if, indeed, it is any part of it. A universal feeling, whether well or ill founded, can not be safely disregarded. We can not, then, make them equals. It does seem to me that systems of gradual emancipation might be adopted; but for their tardiness in this I will not undertake to judge our brethren of the South.

While I was at the hotel to-day an elderly gentleman called upon me to know whether I was really in favor of producing a perfect equality between the negroes and white people. While I had not proposed to myself on this occasion to say much on that subject, yet as the question was asked me, I thought I would occupy perhaps five minutes in saying something in regard to it. I will say, then, that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races; that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they can not so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race.

I want, furthermore, to call your attention to this important fact: That after four years of war had embittered men's feelings, after four years of war had got men on both sides at the blood-boiling point, where they sought more to destroy and punish than they sought conclusions of calm reason, Abraham Lincoln, up to a week before the time he was assassinated, had gone no further

than the Mississippi constitution goes to-day. He said, in a letter to Judge Hunt, of Louisiana:

Can it not be possible that you can make some provision for even admitting to suffrage such of these people as are amongst their best educated men and most intelligent classes?

I quote from memory. But this is not all, Mr. Chairman. Some of you remember the late Senator Fessenden, of Maine, who, when discussing the Chinese-exclusion bill in the Senate, said this:

I by no means assent to the doctrine that the negroes are required by the Constitution of the United States to be placed on an equal footing in the States with white citizens.

GREAT REPUBLICAN LEADERS DECLARE THEIR CONVICTIONS.

Preston King, a Republican Senator from New York, a man of great ability, thought the provision in the Oregon constitution against permitting free negroes to settle in the State was harsh, but declared:

I certainly would not be in favor of encouraging the immigration of any considerable number of black men to settle and live among a white population. I think it is the interest of both races that they should live apart.

He favored, so Senator George, of Mississippi, said, the settlement of the free blacks in Central and South America, and he was, he said, perfectly willing that the people of the new free States should exercise their discretion, and exclude negroes if they saw proper.

Remember, Senator King was not discussing whether he would be willing to give negroes suffrage in New York, but whether they ought to be permitted to immigrate thither.

So do I, wherever it is possible, favor keeping them apart, but wherever it is no longer possible for them to live apart—if condemned by historical consequence to live together—I think they should live together upon a working plan whereby civilization itself shall be saved. I think it is brave and noble to meet with a bold and honest front the race problems with which we are confronted. I think it is absolutely foolish to go, like knights-errant, into places all around the world hunting up race problems for the pure fun of solving them.

While I would like to keep the Chinaman and other inferior races away from the white man's country for the purpose of securing as much homogeneity of race, and therefore of aspiration, social and political experience, and tradition as possible, I would also, if I had my way, keep the white man away from the black man's, and the yellow man's, and the brown man's country, and I would not have him superimpose himself upon them. So much for Fessenden and King. Now, I will ask you to listen to this from Judge Edmunds, of Vermont. He says:

This feeling against the Chinaman and this race feeling generally is based upon the belief that nations and races as they have been constituted by the God of nature—

Thank heaven for the word! God made these races, gentlemen. "He fixed their boundaries." Why, I frequently hear people talking on this line, say: "Why should either rule the other? Why should they not live together in perfect fraternity and perfect peace, governing together a common country?" Simply because "God made them." And until God changes them, with their instincts, with their prejudices, their evolution, their aspirations, with their separate characters—theirself, indeed—they are for all purposes of government like water and oil; they will not mix one with the other; one or the other must float; you may have your choice as to which one of the two shall float, but no other choice under God do you have. But to read on further from Senator Edmunds:

This feeling against the Chinaman and this race feeling generally is based upon the belief that nations and races, as they have been constituted by the God of nature and by political and geographical divisions and arrangements, get on better as separate families with their separate independence and their separate institutions than they do amalgamated together, unless their origin, their race, their tendency, their nature is such that being put together they can assimilate and become one perfect, homogeneous, and prosperous mass.

I do not need to call the attention of Senators to that fundamental principle of domestic government, that in order to success—that just success which produces happiness to its people—no republic can succeed that is not a homogeneous population.

All this, Mr. President, is fundamental in the long reaches of historic observation everywhere.

My learned friends from Massachusetts may begin with Aristotle and come down to Webster, and they will find everywhere over that long reach of human experience that the fundamental idea of a prosperous republic must be the homogeneity of its people.

Ah! "those long reaches of historical observation everywhere!" They are the only unfailing sources of wisdom.

Now, if the House will indulge me for a moment, I intend to read something else. I intend to read something which, I will say, was intended by me as a grand hailing sign of the white people of the South to their brethren upon this continent and especially upon the Pacific slope. My friends upon the Pacific slope, you have never asked us for bread when dealing with your race problem, which is absolutely insignificant in comparison with ours, without getting what you wanted.

Time and time again we have plead with you for bread and you have given us a stone, and not because you believe any more than

I believe that there is any inborn, inherent, and natural equality among all "featherless bipeds" on the surface of this globe, but for other reasons which I do not intend to go into now. God knows this question is not a question for harsh language nor for crimination nor for recrimination. Moreover, it is not a question of boasting because of what we have done to save ourselves. We have done the best we could do. We propose to do the best we hereafter can do.

Some of our methods have perhaps been crude and some of them perhaps wrong, but we have at any rate done one thing; we have come out after a long and unsuccessful war, and then after a longer and still more unsuccessful and humiliating reconstruction period, with the white ribbon, as the symbol of the white man's civilization, still fluttering upon the tips of our lances, and with God's blessing we will try to make it float forever there. Soon after I came to the Congress of the United States, in talking upon a Chinese-exclusion bill, I used the language which I said I would quote, some of which I will read. I said:

I have found that human nature, all over the world, from the mouth of the Mississippi to the mouth of the Danube, is just about the same thing, within the same broad racial limits. Within the great limits which God has fixed (and it happens accidentally that that is Senator Edmunds's language too), guarded by certain instincts, impulses, tendencies, traditions—within those lines—human nature is the same everywhere. I am willing to trust the motives, the manhood, the generosity, the capacity for self-government, and the capacity for governing, if need be, inferior races, inherent in the white people of the Pacific slope, just as I have appealed to them and as those who have stood here before me have appealed to them and others to trust the capacity for self-government of the people of the South.

I added the following:

I shall support this bill, believing as I do that the white race in the West, as at the South, standing upon the higher round of the ladder of civilization, is willing to put its hands down to the inferior race standing upon the lower level and bring that race up, not to the same level, because, God willing, as the inferior race comes up to our old position, we shall go up by our own development to a new one, bringing the inferior up behind us as we go. But if in response to our invitation to come up higher he shall say to us, "Come thou down lower to me," we answer him in the language of Tennyson, indignant and astonished—

"What! I to herd with narrow foreheads,
Vacant of our glorious gains?"

I tell you it is not only the highest law, but it is the highest duty, of every life to secure self-preservation and self-perpetuation. I care not whether the life be the life of an individual, a family, a race, a nation, or of a civilization. God has given to everything worthy of life in this world the instinct and has made it a duty to resist attacks from whatsoever quarter, and although your problem out on the Pacific coast is not as serious a one as that with which we are struggling in the South, it may in time become so.

There will come a time, if the influx of Chinamen goes on upon the Pacific slope, when the demagogue will, in order to bolster up party purposes, demand that the Mongolian be equipped with the suffrage "in order that he may defend himself."

I do not remember a single effort of any great man that is so indelibly impressed upon my mind as that of Thomas Jefferson, made early in the history of this country, when he tried to prevail upon our forefathers in Virginia, not only to stop the importation of negroes, but to emancipate and deport them. He failed. He acknowledged that the failure of the effort was because the people were not prepared for it. He went further and said that they would be less and less prepared for it as the numbers of the race increased and antagonisms grew, "yet the day is not distant," he said, "when they must bear and adopt it or worse will follow." Then he added, "For there is nothing more certainly written in the Book of Fate than these two things—first, that these people are to be free, and, secondly, that no two unequal races can long live on the same soil equally free."

And I have frequently thought that there were few men who ever existed, not only in this country, but anywhere else, who equaled Thomas Jefferson in his magnificent foresight. On the occasion referred to I said further:

Had there been prescience enough—that sort of prescience with which intellect is endowed by unselfish love of country—to have followed this greatest of Americans in his leadership then, we would have been rid of a constant threat to our civilization and to our race.

We would not have been standing as we are now upon the very verge of a volcano, ready at almost any time to break forth. We may possess little of the sympathy of some of you gentlemen whom I am trying to help to-day; we may at times possess but little hope except the assurance given us by the fact that we have hitherto proven equal to every emergency, and shall, in the providence of God, prove equal to every emergency in the future; still we trust that we may always conjoin law and order with liberty; that we may, while preserving our own civilization, have the manhood to be just to those to whom we must be schoolmasters.

I am willing, then, Mr. Speaker, as long as the men of the Pacific slope do not ask anything inhuman, do not ask of me anything cruel or anything unkind or immoral, to leave the settlement of this question entirely to them. And I am glad to see that early in the history of this Chinese problem they have been wiser than we were in the early history of the negro problem in the South, when the small number of Africans on this continent constituted a condition other than that with which we are now confronted, and that they are willing to take the question up frankly and deal with it boldly and resolutely.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another thing to which I wish to call your attention. "An ounce of prevention is better worth than a pound of cure;" and the right of self-preservation carries along with it, for the nation, or the race, or the civilization, just as the right of self-defense for the individual

does, the right to anticipate deadly attack. So that all these arguments of gentlemen on the floor that there are only 106,000 or 160,000 Chinese in this country do not appeal to my mind at all. When I see a gentleman over there rising in his place, with anger in his eyes, throwing his hand behind him, and I know he is armed, and I know that there is about him the deadly weapon from whose throat may soon come a deadly missile for me, I have a right to anticipate the deadly attack; and, sir, on the same principle nations have the right, and races above all others have the right, to anticipate.

And I tell you, my friends, that no feelings of philanthropy or of justice have ever called on a race which had through the centuries accumulated the fruits of civilization to surrender any part of that accumulation. No race which through heredity and evolution of capacities has received a training sufficient to make of its members men worthy to command almost every emergency has ever been justly called on to surrender one single bit of the fruits which have come to it through the centuries in that way.

"For I doubt not through the ages one increasing purpose runs,
And the thoughts of men are widen'd with the process of the suns."

The idea of Tennyson in that couplet is that through the fruits of labor and progress races and nations, like individuals, grow to become wiser and more capable of governing themselves, and the "God in History" uses, as an instrument through which to govern the world, the developed common sense and common conscience of the people.

And so the world goes on and attains true democracy in the course of time, but not immediately. It does not come all at once. It must come gradually through processes of evolution, through the ages and through the centuries. For a race which has through this process of evolution equipped itself for mastery, as well as self-government, tamely to sit down and permit itself to be inundated by Mongolians, or by any other inferior race, not thus equipped and trained, is, in my opinion, not only self-stultification but race suicide; and I, for one, shall not stand here to prevent the people of the Pacific coast from taking, with reference to this matter, a proper course which their own judgment inspires to bring about a solution of the troubles which surround them and to work out their own safety. I shall not do it unless at some time they shall demand something of me which I, in my turn, would not ask of them—something inhuman, something cruel, something wrong.

I tell you, my friends on the Pacific slope, we alone can understand you; we alone on this American continent can understand you; and you, I hope, some day, will try to understand us better; and I think we can not cultivate the acquaintance and knowledge of one another any better than by uniting frankly and fearlessly whenever these questions are presented to do the right thing, trusting our white brethren elsewhere also to do the right, until we have proof positive that they are doing wrong or until they demand something of us that is palpably wrong.

Now, my friends, I have the utmost confidence in this: I have indeed no doubt, that the white race on the Pacific coast will remember two things which William Shakespeare has said, which I am sure that we of the South will also keep in mind. One is that—

* * * it is excellent
To have a giant's strength; but it is tyrannous
To use it like a giant.

And the second is as true of a race as it is of an individual:

* * * to thine own self be true,
And it must follow, as the night the day,
Thou canst not then be false to any man.

I say that is true of a race. The race that is true to its better instincts, to its own self-preservation, to the perpetuation of its own civilization and its higher ideals, although somebody may resent the mastership which it takes of others for the time being, can not be false to any race, but must necessarily, as a part of its own advancing civilization, drag the other, no less volens, along with it to a higher state than it now occupies.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I wish to say that I shall vote for the amendments offered to the bill by these gentlemen who understand the problem with which they are confronted, who understand the race that has given them this trouble; because I believe that the Chinese race, as far as I have seen it, is but little superior to the race which I know so well, and which has given us so much trouble, with the aid and assistance very frequently of gentlemen on the other side of this House.

When a race has not been developed up to the point where it has a trained common sense and common conscience, right governmental aspirations, and right purposes—the true self-governing instinct—all law, all statute books, all mere abstractions sink like waste paper to the bottom, saturated in the water, and vanish without anything being left.

I once said upon the floor of this House, and I repeat it now, that Mississippi has not, because she could not, of course, put into her constitution one word that is at variance with the fifteenth or the fourteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States. In the opinion of Mississippians, in the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the opinion of Judge Cooley, she has not done this. I do not deny that the only reason why she did not do it was because it would have been unconstitutional. Whenever you want to be honest and right about this matter of cutting off our representation, leave us free, then, of the

shackles of the amendments, both the fourteenth and fifteenth. We will meet you there; but as long as they are in the Constitution we are going to try to obey them.

We have disqualified illiteracy. But in that connection I want to say this—that there is a difference between ignorance and illiteracy. We have disqualified illiteracy, but sometimes an illiterate man is tolerably well educated and sometimes a literate man is very ignorant. If you take 10,000 Scotch, English, Welsh, or Americans who can not read a letter in a book and shipwreck them to-morrow upon some island where they can find physical sustenance and support, you would find in a year or so when you went back there that they had a government—crude and imperfect, perhaps, but protecting property, conserving and safeguarding the virtue of females, defending the sanctity of home life; and you could take 10,000 Indians educated at Carlisle or at Hampton and shipwreck them in the same place and go back there in two or three years and they would have their old tribal relations.

You may take 10,000 negroes, graduates of Harvard College, if you could find them, and leave them by themselves without white guidance and without touch of the white man's current of thought and civilization. Go back in a generation and half of the men would be killed and the other half would have at least two wives each and have something very near to tribal relations themselves. But Mississippi could validly and constitutionally not make race distinctions, and she did not. She was sorry to disfranchise some good white men capable of self-government, but she had to do it to be fair with the Constitution.

The only way in which the white people of the South can be made to fail to be true to themselves and just to their inferiors would be to stir up once more, if you will, the smoldering fires of race hatred, which had died out because of lack of provocation developed under political excitement of campaigns occurring annually, biennially, and quadrennially. Then in moments of great provocation, in moments of great excitement, they might perhaps forget that, while they had "a giant's strength," they ought not "to use it as giants." But if you will let us alone—let us work out our own problems—we will try to solve them upon the theories which I have indicated.

Now, a few words just from a legal standpoint, and I shall have done with this discussion. The ostensible object of these resolutions, which go by the name of my friend from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER], is to investigate certain "legal conditions." Will any man in the world tell me that that is the only object of these resolutions? Why, if that were so the constitutions and the books of laws would explain that for themselves. Is it this—to investigate the methods of carrying on the elections in the South, to see if there is intimidation and fraud? If that is the intention, then let them investigate election methods and corruptions all over the country. If it is to investigate the legal question alone, there are the books and you can investigate them.

Now, so far as Mississippi is concerned, she disfranchises nobody except for crime, which is permitted by the fourteenth amendment, and on an educational condition, which Judge Cooley says is not an "abridgment or denial of suffrage," because it is not cutting off entirely suffrage, but merely submitting the voter to conditions precedent, which he can comply with if he will take the trouble to learn how to read. And then again on the tax qualification.

The poll taxes and all other taxes must be paid. The rich man, who is generally white, has to pay taxes on every dollar he owns plus a poll tax, while the poor man has to pay the poll tax only and is not required with us, by any power of legal enforcement, to pay that sum, unless he wants to vote. Judge Cooley says that that is not an abridgment of the suffrage because it merely requires a condition precedent to be complied with which each man of ordinary thrift and worth could comply with and which is for the betterment of society. I am not quoting the language exactly, but will do so. It is from Judge Cooley on the Principles of Constitutional Law, which is an elementary book, comprehensible by everybody, and which I will insert at this place:

The second clause of the fourteenth article was intended to influence the States to bring about by their voluntary action the same result that is now accomplished by this amendment. It provided that when the right to vote was denied to any of the male inhabitants of a State, being 21 years of age and citizens of the United States, or any way abridged except for participation in crime, the basis of representation in Congress should be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens should bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State. By this the purpose was to induce the States to admit colored freemen to the privilege of suffrage by reducing the representation and influence of the States in the Federal Government in case they refused.

No opportunity occurred for testing the efficacy of this plan previous to the adoption of the fifteenth article, and it can not therefore be affirmed whether it would or would not have been successful. Important questions, however, may still arise under it. The provision is general; it is not limited to freedmen, but it applies to wherever the right to vote is denied to make citizens of the proper age, or is abridged for other causes than for participation in crime. The State of Connecticut denies the right of suffrage to all who can not read, and Massachusetts and Missouri to all who can not both read and write, and many of the States admit no one to the privilege of suffrage unless he is a taxpayer.

So in the majority of the States a citizen absent therefrom, though in the public service, can not vote, because the State requires as a condition the personal presence of the voter at the polls of his municipality. Possibly it may be said in respect to such cases that the representation of the State should be reduced in proportion to the number of those who are excluded because they can not read or write or do not pay taxes or are absent. It is not likely, however, that any such position would be sustained. To require the payment of a capitation tax is no denial of suffrage; it is demanding only the preliminary performance of public duty, and may be classed, as may also presence at the polls, with registration or the observance of any other preliminary to insure fairness and protect against fraud.

Nor can it be said to require ability to read is any denial of suffrage. To refuse to receive one's vote because he was born in some particular country rather than elsewhere, or because of his color, or because of any natural quality or peculiarity which it would be impossible for him to overcome, is plainly a denial of suffrage. But ability to read is something within the power of any man. It is not difficult to attain it, and it is no hardship to require it. On the contrary, the requirement only by indirection compels one to appropriate a personal benefit he might otherwise neglect. It denies to no man the suffrage, but the privilege is freely tendered to all, subject only to a condition that is beneficial in its performance, and light in its burden. If a property qualification, or the payment of taxes upon property when one has none to be taxed, is made a condition to suffrage, there may be room for more question.

A clause in the Mississippi constitution requires that the voter shall be able to read and write before he shall have the privilege of suffrage, and we have a clause that is called the "understanding clause." The general impression seems to be that we do not allow a man to vote in Mississippi unless he goes to a registrar and the registrar sees if he can understand the constitution. This is an error, like that other impression that there is no appeal from the decision of the registrar. Any man who can read can vote in Mississippi, and we ascertain that fact just as it is ascertained elsewhere where the qualification exists. Why, any man that can read is not required by our constitution to understand anything, upon the schoolmaster's theory that the man who reads is necessarily not ignorant. Sometimes he is very ignorant, while on the other hand sometimes an illiterate man is very knowing. That is, the so-called "understanding clause" is an extension of the franchise, not an abridgment.

I want to say right now that there is not a single clause of the Mississippi constitution that operates against the black man that does not operate against the white man subject to the same conditions precedent, whether in theory, in law, upon the statute book, or in principle or practice at the polls. I want to say right now that there are more negroes—black people, colored people—who get admitted to the suffrage in Mississippi upon the "understanding clause" than there are white people; and it grows out of race instinct. The white man who can not read or write feels that it is a humiliation for him to say so, and to ask for an understanding examination. The negro does not feel that humiliation, and goes and asks for it. There are very few who ever vote under it, either black or white; but absolutely more colored people than there are white people vote under that provision.

Now, gentlemen, if, upon the other hand, a demand that the voter shall be registered is an abridgment of the Constitution in Mississippi, it is an abridgment in every other State in the Union which requires previous registration and previous residence in the precinct or in the State or in the county. If an educational qualification is legally an abridgment, it is an abridgment in Connecticut, it is an abridgment in Massachusetts, it is an abridgment in Vermont, and if the understanding qualification mentioned in the law books, so little resorted to in practice, be an abridgment, what must the requirement be in the State of Vermont—the requirement to be "of good moral character?"

Mr. PALMER. Did the gentleman ever hear of anybody denying that proposition?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. What proposition?

Mr. PALMER. That these abridgments are abridgments in every State in the North as well as in the South?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am pretty well convinced that gentlemen in their hearts, some way or other, are expecting to make some sort of a difference, or else this resolution would never have been introduced into the House, and if my friend is candid, so is he, is he not?

Mr. PALMER. No; it covers every State in the Union.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Verbally, yes; intentionally, no. I believe, as surely as I am standing here, that this resolution was introduced to strike at North Carolina, South Carolina, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama, and at them alone.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I understood the gentleman to say that in his judgment the State of Mississippi had not denied or abridged the right of any male inhabitant, 21 years of age, a citizen of the United States, to vote, within the meaning of the Constitution. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I understood the gentleman to say also that the method of the administration of the election laws in the State of Mississippi was altogether fair and impartial.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Undoubtedly; but your resolution does not go to the method at all. Your question is irrelevant. Still I answer in the affirmative.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Then what objection can the gentleman have, speaking from the standpoint of his own State, to any kind of an investigation of this question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Because it inaugurates once more the interference by a partisan legislative body with the suffrage question in the South instead of leaving the question to be determined by the people of the States or by the courts; it will inaugurate once more the going at each session of Congress a step further in centralization and interference with local self-government, and it will inaugurate a partisan majority report, a partisan minority report, and a disturbance of business enterprise and budding progress all over the South.

I will say to my friend that I do not frankly believe, as a Democrat, speaking from a party standpoint, that these resolutions are going to do the Republican party any good, or that they are going to do the Democratic party any harm; but they are going to do the South a great deal of harm. I love the South better than I do the Democratic party, much as I love it and am grateful to it. When the people see the sword of Damocles hanging over them, and what they regard as an effort being made in any part of the Union to disrupt the social and political conditions again by trying to bring them into a position where it may be remotely possible that we may have another carnival of vice, crime, ignorance, and Africanization, it will disturb the business of the South, producing business anarchy and threatening social chaos.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Will the gentleman allow a suggestion?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The gentleman knows that there is quite a general belief throughout the country that some States have denied or abridged the right of citizens of the United States to vote, and that they are enjoying a representation that has no constitutional basis. Now, would it not be worth much to the South and the whole country to have an investigation and to demonstrate to the country the truth of the gentleman's conclusion that these States have not disfranchised citizens and that they are administering the election laws of the State with the utmost fairness?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Surely my friend and I want to be candid and honest on this question. I certainly would not object to any fair and impartial investigation by a nonpolitical authority. But surely the gentleman does not mean to tell me that he considers a committee of the House of Representatives, appointed upon a resolution of this sort, as anything more than a bipartisan committee at best, a tribunal which will bring back two reports—a majority report and a minority report—and both of them framed solidly, every Republican for one and every Democrat for the other, along party lines.

Mr. JACKSON of Kansas. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Let me finish my statement and then I will yield to the gentleman.

Now, if you want to investigate, why not do it properly? The jury system in North Carolina is founded on the grandfather clause. The whole constitution hangs together. Why not make a case and carry it to the Supreme Court and let it decide the question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave for just long enough to answer a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that his time may be extended for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I should like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi a question. He knows, of course, that it is one of the important duties of the House of Representatives to apportion representation. Does he not know that the House must base its action upon its own information, and that it can only acquire information through its own agencies or organs?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. No; I do not know that. First, because Congress has exhausted its power of apportionment until 1910; second, because I think it would be much fairer for the House to base its action on evidence collected and conclusion obtained through the courts or in some other nonpartisan way.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Well, that is a new proposition.

Mr. JACKSON of Kansas. In view of the proposed investigation as to the validity of the election laws of certain States, I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] whether he is willing to consent at the proper time to an amendment that we may investigate as to the validity of the law of any State which in any way prohibits a candidate from accepting a nomination from more than one party?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is a proposition I do not know anything about.

Mr. JACKSON of Kansas. Well, I will take pleasure in giving the gentleman some information on that subject, if he will permit me.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I have not heard any complaint—certainly not in my part of the country—with reference to that matter, and have not heard any restriction proposed upon the action of candidates in that respect.

Mr. JACKSON of Kansas. Well, it is, I may say, with sadness and sorrow that I inform the gentleman that that question has been raised in the great State of Kansas.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I understood that the Democratic candidate for the Presidency in 1896 and in 1900 was nominated by several different political parties. But I have not understood that any constitutional objection was raised, and as a Federal question it occurs to me it is one with which this body has nothing to do.

Mr. JACKSON of Kansas. I want to inform the gentleman that since that time the Republican party in the State of Kansas has said that it was a crime to accept nominations from several political parties and that it should not be repeated.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Let me ask the gentleman whether he does not believe that that particular question is a local one—local to the State of Kansas?

Mr. JACKSON of Kansas. No more local to the State of Kansas than the other question to Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, or any other Southern State whose election provisions you propose to investigate.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I would ask whether that—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I shall be glad to discuss the question with the gentleman some other time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I ask consent to insert in the RECORD the language of Cooley's Principles of Constitutional Law, to which I have referred, together with the references given by the author. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. CANNON. If this concludes the general debate—

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I would like an opportunity to speak for about seven minutes in the morning. If I can be recognized now, I will yield the floor for a motion to adjourn.

Mr. CANNON. I think the gentleman from Indiana has ingenuity enough, if anybody should undertake to oppose his request, to get ten minutes to-morrow.

Mr. BENTON. I think we can give him ten minutes.

Mr. CANNON. I move that the committee now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LAWRENCE reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union had had under consideration the sundry civil appropriation bill and had come to no resolution thereon.

RECIPROCAL TRADE RELATIONS WITH CUBA.

Mr. PAYNE. By direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I report back, with a recommendation that it pass, the bill (H. R. 12765) to provide for reciprocal trade relations with Cuba.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. PAYNE. I desire to give notice that I shall ask the House to consider this bill on Tuesday of next week—the 8th of April, I believe. I now ask unanimous consent that any member or members of the committee may file his or their dissenting views at any time during the present week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that any member of the Committee on Ways and Means may have leave to file minority views in respect to the bill just reported at any time during the present week? The Chair hears no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 12315. An act granting an increase of pension to James Todd;

H. R. 2273. An act granting a pension to Martha A. De Lamater;

H. R. 10486. An act granting a pension to Alida Payne; and

H. R. 11418. An act granting an increase of pension to Hannah T. Knowles.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama, for two weeks, on account of important business.

To Mr. MORRELL, for four days, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. DE GRAFFENREID, indefinitely, on account of important business.

Mr. CANNON. I move that the House adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed in the court in the case of Dorcas, Elizabeth, and Samuel McCammon, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Director of the Mint submitting an estimate of appropriation for mint at San Francisco—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. SOUTHARD, from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12705) to amend section 3536, Revised Statutes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1262); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOMBS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 257) to establish a light-house and fog-signal station at Mukilteo Point, near the city of Everett, State of Washington, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1263); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 258) providing additional funds for the establishment of a light-house and fog-signal station at Browns Point, on Commencement Bay, State of Washington, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1264); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 260) to establish a fog-signal at Battery Point, State of Washington, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1265); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 265) to establish a light-house and fog-signal station on Burrows Island, State of Washington, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1266); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHAFROTH, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12796) providing for free homesteads in the Ute Indian Reservation in Colorado, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1275); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MANN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3513) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River, at or near Parkville, Mo., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1267); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12765) to provide for reciprocal trade relations with Cuba, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1276); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. WEEKS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 957) for the relief of J. J. L. Peel, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a

report (No. 1268); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. THOMAS of Iowa, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2216) for the relief of Elizabeth Muhleman, widow, and the heirs at law of Samuel A. Muhleman, deceased, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1269); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4233) for the relief of David V. Howell, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1270); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CURTIS, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12710) for the relief of Elizabeth McKinney, a citizen Pottawatomie Indian, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1271); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STORM, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2393) for the relief of Joseph B. Sargent, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1274); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, adverse reports were delivered to the Clerk, and laid on the table, as follows:

Mr. PARKER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6458) for the relief of Thomas F. Tobey, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1272); which said bill and report were laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8544) to place Elias H. Parsons on the retired list of the Army, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1273); which said bill and report were laid on the table.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 13205) to provide for the erection of a monument for Joseph Anthony Mower—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 13206) providing for the appointment of civil engineers in the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SCHIRM (by request): A bill (H. R. 13207) to incorporate the Washington Cooling Company—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 13208) to authorize the United States and West Indies Railroad and Steamship Company, of Florida, to construct a bridge across the Manatee River, in the State of Florida—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: A resolution (H. Res. 185) that the Speaker of the House appoint some person specially qualified to have the care and charge of House bathing rooms—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SULZER: A resolution (H. Res. 186) concerning the Boer war going on in South Africa—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Memorial of the legislature of Minnesota, in favor of allowing the State of Minnesota 5 per cent of the proceeds of public lands appropriated for military services to the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the legislature of Minnesota, in favor of Senate bill 3575—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRIS: Memorial by the legislature of Minnesota, relating to Senate bill 3575—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial to Congress by the legislature of Minnesota, respecting the 5 per cent of the minimum price of the public lands that have been appropriated as compensation for military services rendered the United States since the admission of Minnesota into the Union—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 13209) to correct the military record of Henry Fitzgerald—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROMWELL: A bill (H. R. 13210) granting an increase of pension to Gustav Tafel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 13211) granting a pension to Melissa Burton, widow of William Burton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 13212) to correct the military record of Henry N. Penfield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 13213) granting a pension to John A. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13214) granting an increase of pension to William W. Rollins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HANBURY: A bill (H. R. 13215) to correct the military record of Bernard Corrigan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13216) to correct the military record of Simon W. Larkin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JETT: A bill (H. R. 13217) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Dodge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13218) granting an increase of pension to Henry L. Karns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13219) granting a pension to Alcinda Notestine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOY: A bill (H. R. 13220) granting an increase of pension to William Sendelbach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 13221) granting a pension to Benjamin W. Keith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 13222) for the relief of Charles Candy—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13223) for the relief of Mary E. O. Dashiell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13224) granting an increase of pension to John Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEVIN: A bill (H. R. 13225) granting an increase of pension to George Hallick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13226) granting a pension to William Warner—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 13227) granting a pension to Elizabeth J. Emry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13228) granting an increase of pension to George Russell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 13229) granting a pension to Rensalaer W. Zindle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 13230) granting an increase of pension to Luther Towne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13231) for the relief of the estate of Preston Bond—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 13232) granting an increase of pension to Alanson A. Austin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 13233) granting a pension to William A. Nelson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER: A bill (H. R. 13234) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Johnson, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 13235) granting an increase of pension to Anna Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZENOR: A bill (H. R. 13236) granting a pension to James Long—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 13237) granting an increase of pension to John V. Sanders—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13238) granting an increase of pension to Carlos M. Niles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13239) granting an increase of pension to Ervin Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13240) granting an increase of pension to Nimrod F. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13241) for the relief of John S. Friend, of Eldorado, State of Kansas—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: A bill (H. R. 13242) granting a pension to Melissa and Lavinia Pendock—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 13243) granting a pension to Leah Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: Petition of George E. Hedges and other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., for the passage of a bill to prevent the desecration of the national flag—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Protest of the Merchants' Exchange, Buffalo, N. Y., against the passage of Senate bill 1118—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALL of Delaware: Petition of citizens of Kent County, Del., favoring the passage of Senate bill 1891, for a further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Operative Plasterers' International Association No. 38; of Wilmington Typographical Union, No. 123; of Amalgamated Wood Workers' Union No. 108, and of Wilmington Lodge, No. 184, International Association of Machinists, of Wilmington, Del., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BROMWELL: Papers to accompany House bill 13210, granting an increase of pension to Gustav Tafel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 10403, granting a pension to Emma Plumb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: Resolutions of the Wisconsin Game Protective Association, urging the passage of the Lacey bills, H. R. 10306 and H. R. 11535, with reference to the preservation of game—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BULL: Resolutions of Granite Cutters' Union No. 2, of Newport, R. I., favoring the construction of war vessels in the United States navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Amasa M. Eaton and other citizens of Providence, R. I., for the collection of statistics relating to marriage and divorce—to the Select Committee on the Census.

Also, resolutions of Iron Molders' Union No. 41, of Providence, R. I., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DOUGHERTY: Resolution of Stanberry Lodge, Locomotive Firemen, Stanberry, Mo., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of the same lodge, favoring extension of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOVENER: Resolutions of Bricklayers' Union No. 1, of Wheeling, W. Va., favoring a reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Stone Cutters' Association, Flint Glass Workers' Union No. 59, Potters' Union No. 28, and Potters' Union No. 6, all of Wheeling, W. Va.; Stone Cutters' Association of New Martinsville, and Potters' Union of New Cumberland, W. Va., favoring educational test in the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: Petition of Pee Division, No. 265, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Florence, S. C., favoring the passage of the Hoar-Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolution of Wisconsin Game Protective Association, Milwaukee, Wis., in favor of the enactment of the Lacey bill for the protection of game animals—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Resolutions of Captain Charles W. Chapman Circle, No. 60, Ladies of Grand Army of the Republic, of Allegheny, Pa., favoring a bill providing pensions to certain officers and men in the Army and Navy of the United States when 50 years of age and over, and increasing widows' pensions to \$12 per month—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the National Hay Association, Winchester, Ind., favoring House bill 8337 and Senate bill 3575, amending the interstate-commerce act—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Resolutions of Division No. 73, Order of Railway Conductors, Ashtabula, Ohio, and Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers No. 368, Atlanta, Ga., favoring the passage of the Hoar-Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASKINS: Petition of Martha Washington Council, No. 3, Daughters of Liberty, East Burke, Vt., favoring restricted immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HITT: Resolutions of Atlantic Coast Seamen's Union in regard to employment of Chinese stokers on Pacific vessels—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL: Resolutions of Trenton Division, Order of Railway Telegraphers, Trenton, N. J., favoring the passage of the Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LACEY: Resolution of Wisconsin Game Protective Association, favoring the passage of House bill No. 10306, for the preservation of wild animals and game birds—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, resolutions of Union No. 162, of Ottumwa, Iowa, favoring the passage of the Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Resolutions of Building Trades Council, of

Yonkers, N. Y., for increase of pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of Signal Mount Lodge, No. 372, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, favoring restrictive immigration laws—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of the same lodge, in favor of the exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MANN: Resolutions of Maine Lodge, No. 545, of East St. Louis, Ill.; Beau coup Lodge, No. 549, of Carbondale, Ill., and J. L. Burlingame Lodge, No. 320, of Flora, Ill., favoring the passage of the Foraker-Corliss safety-appliance bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts: Petition of J. Riley Rogers and other residents of Byfield, Mass., in favor of the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MORRIS: Petition of Plumbers' Union No. 11, of Duluth, Minn., for the exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Stone Cutters' Association and Carpenters' Union of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the construction of naval vessels at Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NAPHEN: Petition of the Iroquois Club, of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the construction of war vessels in the United States navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. OLMSTED: Resolutions of Patriotic Branch, No. 391, Polish National Society, of Lykens, Pa., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolutions of Seneca G. Simmons Circle, No. 17, Ladies of Grand Army of the Republic, Harrisburg, Pa., favoring a bill providing pensions to certain officers and men in the Army and Navy of the United States when 50 years of age and over, and increasing widows' pensions to \$12 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Typographical Union No. 14, of Harrisburg, Pa., in favor of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Harrisburg Lodge, No. 333, and Herculean Lodge, No. 574, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and Union No. 278, of Lebanon, Pa., and petition of 51 citizens of Shiremans-town, Pa., favoring more rigid restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OTJEN: Resolutions of Wisconsin Game Protective Association, favoring the passage of House bill 10306, for the preservation of wild animals and game birds—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. PARKER: Resolutions of Essex Lodge, No. 72, Railroad Trainmen, and Iron Molders' Union No. 91, of Newark, N. J., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Steam Fitters' Union No. 40, of Newark, N. J., for the passage of House bill 9330, for a further restriction of Chinese immigration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBB: Paper in support of House bill 12644, authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish an artificial leg to Allen P. Dace—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS: Sundry petitions of and letters from citizens of Massachusetts, favoring the construction of war vessels at the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RUCKER: Protest of merchants of Jacksonville, Mo., against House bill 6578, known as the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RYAN: Petitions of branches Nos. 164, 380, and Synowie Wolnosci, Polish societies of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 16—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolutions of Building Trades Council of Yonkers, N. Y., indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: Resolutions of Beet Sugar Factory Company, of Fort Collins, Colo., in opposition to reductions in the tariff on raw sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SKILES: Resolutions of Bricklayers and Masons' Union No. 29, Lorain, Ohio, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of C. P. Ogden Post, No. 569, Nova, Ohio, favoring the building of war ships in the navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Bricklayers and Masons' Union No. 29, Lorain, Ohio, and Deer Lick Division, No. 292, Railway Conductors, Chicago, Ill., favoring a further restriction of Chinese immigration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolution of Polish Society of Wallingford, Conn., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-

General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: Resolutions of Park Lodge, No. 555, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and Detroit River Lodge, No. 2, of Detroit, Mich., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of Polish Society No. 53, of Detroit, Mich., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolutions of Charles T. Foster Post, No. 42, of Lansing, Mich., regarding employees at the United States navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: Papers to accompany House bill 13230, granting a pension to Luther Town—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STARK: Petition of Thomas H. Dry and 22 other citizens of Diller, Nebr., favoring an amendment to the Constitution making polygamy a crime—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of M. W. Dinneen and 88 other citizens of Fillmore County, Nebr., asking that the United States tender its good offices for intervention between the Boer Republic and Great Britain to the end that hostilities may cease—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of the National Association of Clothiers, of New York, indorsing the Ray bankruptcy bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Building Trades Council of New York, favoring increase of compensation to letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: Resolution of Esther Lodge, No. 352, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Estherville, Iowa, favoring the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Paper to accompany House bill, granting a pension to Nancy V. J. Ferrell, Elizabethtown, Ill.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS: Petitions of officers of the California National Guard, favoring House bill 11654, increasing the efficiency of the militia—to the Committee on Militia.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, April 1, 1902.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings; when, on request of Mr. HALE, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand approved, if there be no objection.

PERSONS IN CLASSIFIED SERVICE FROM SOUTH CAROLINA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Civil Service Commissioners, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 24th ultimo, a list of persons now holding places in the classified service charged to the State of South Carolina, their names, present addresses, etc.; which, with the accompanying paper, was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (H. R. 2273) granting a pension to Martha A. De Lamater;
A bill (H. R. 10486) granting a pension to Alida Payne;
A bill (H. R. 11418) granting an increase of pension to Hannah T. Knowles; and
A bill (H. R. 12315) granting an increase of pension to James Todd.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented petitions of sundry citizens of Eden, Wayne, and Akron, all in the State of New York, praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Building Trades Council, American Federation of Labor, of Yonkers, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the salary of letter carriers; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Manufacturers' Association of New York City and Brooklyn, N. Y., and a petition of the Granite Cutters' Local Union, American Federation of Labor, of Putnam County, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of